



Class

265.323R

Book

M861

General Theological Seminary Library

Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY

Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

11/1.
2

THE OFFERINGS
MADE LIKE UNTO THE SON OF GOD

THE OFFERINGS

MADE

LIKE UNTO THE SON OF GOD

BY

WALTER STEPHEN MOULE, M.A.

PRINCIPAL OF C.M.S. TRAINING COLLEGE, NINGPO, AND
ARCHDEACON IN CHEKIANG, CHINA

“My heart standeth in awe of Thy words”—PSALM CXIX. 161

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1915

265.323R

M8611

61436

COPIED FROM

TO MY
FATHER AND MOTHER

PREFACE.

THIS book is addressed to those who believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments not only contain but are "God's Word written," a constituency which the writer believes in spite of adverse influences to remain very large, and even to be increasing in numbers. Those of us who share this conviction have every reason to hold fast to it, and to "turn away" from "oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called," which would entangle us in their sophistries and make us agnostics in spite of ourselves. It is not every one of us who can meet all that is plausibly argued, or more often dogmatically asserted, against the traditional belief of the Church of God in the historical reliability and Divine authority of the Scriptures. But it is possible for every one of us to enquire the quarter in which these arguments and assertions originated; when we shall find that as a matter of history they are traceable to the influence and to the theoretical speculations of men who denied God and the existence of the supernatural. However extensively they may prevail within the Christian Church to-day, and whatever refinements have been invented to explain their presence there, the fact remains that they had their birth in unbelief and not in faith. We are inclined to suspect all theories which spring from such a source, on the principle long ago enunciated by Job, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." And writing at the present moment it may be permissible to call attention to results which have followed from "preferring the professor to the apostle" in the moral attitude of the German nation to-day. But quite

✓ apart from such considerations as these, recent years have provided many witnesses to the historic character of the Old Testament records in more than one branch of scientific research. And recent events have tended to revive the study of the Biblical phenomenon of prophecy, in the light of its growing fulfilment, notably as regards the present position and prospects of the Jews. All these things, and others which might be mentioned, we believe to be providential aids to faith in an age of abounding scepticism and credulity. But after all our faith in the Scriptures as being God's Word written does not depend upon these adventitious aids, but rests upon the simple fact that this is what Jesus Christ both held and taught. Just so long as we take our stand for thought and action upon Jesus Christ our position is unshakable. If on the other hand we reject His authority in only one particular, it is difficult to see how we can ever be sure of anything again ; unless indeed we are prepared to claim infallibility for our own powers of criticism and perception. But we have not so learned Jesus Christ as to admit the possibility that He was mistaken in the very things He essayed to teach. We believe rather that in the things of God He is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," the very Word of God incarnate, and it is to us simply incredible that any limitations which He imposed upon Himself in His incarnation actually impaired His ability to instruct us in what is and what is not the Word of God. He then regarded it as axiomatic that the Old Testament Scriptures are indeed the Word of God, and both before and after His resurrection He impressed this truth upon His disciples, who in their turn accepted it, used it, and passed it on. This is the traditional faith of the Church of Christ, and it is entirely reasonable. It is impossible to conceive any higher authority on this vital question than God Himself manifest in the flesh, and the Incarnate Word risen from the dead, and speaking in the world from the light of eternity on this very question. To Him we appeal from every other teacher, and against the highest unaided human intellect, if need

be ; and with Him we continue to abide in this as in every matter.

But then, having by faith in Him a faith also in the Scriptures, we turn to examine them, and lo! they are instinct with His blessed influence and likeness, and our hearts burn within us as they unfold before us in all their pages the things concerning Him ; and we know by the concurrent witness of whatever reasoning faculty we possess that it is indeed the voice and accent of His Father and of ours which is for all time enshrined in these sacred pages. This is at least the experience of the writer of these lines, whatever tests of faith may still be met with in the Holy Book ; and of course these do occur, just as they are always present in Nature and in Providence. The more childlike however his acceptance of the Scriptures as they stand in the final result of their providential history, and the more complete his consciousness of dependence on Divine guidance in reading them, the more clear has been to him their testimony to Jesus Christ, and the stronger the inward conviction of the truth of His testimony to them ; so that what began by being faith has become merged in something which is more akin to knowledge. It is hoped that it may please God to use what has been written for the confirmation of the faith of some readers also. It is true that in the introductory chapter the existence of a reliable record of revelation is spoken of as an assumption merely, preliminary to a certain enquiry. But this is done for the sake of a believer who is sincerely perplexed, and who might be deterred at this stage by a more dogmatic assertion, while willing to give a candid and unprejudiced consideration to a study of the documents as they stand. It is a question however whether the Scriptures are ever opened to purely intellectual and critical examination conducted without reference to the testimony of Jesus Christ, and indeed sometimes with a latent spirit of independence if not of opposition towards it. In the sequel the argument for the truth of the assumption upon which the enquiry is based is not pressed home. It is hoped that, when the

end has been reached, the reader will be thinking no longer of the Divine origin and authority of the Scriptures (which will be evident to his consciousness) but rather of the sufficiency of Jesus Christ for the salvation of the sinner, and of becoming wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

The writer has determined to prosecute an independent enquiry into the typical character of the history and of the Mosaic ritual, rather than to discuss the conclusions of others who have gone before him; but he is mindful of the help derived from many teachers and expositors. He has not consciously overlooked any passage of Scripture which bears upon the subject, or which might modify his explanations of the various symbols; but he will very gratefully accept any additional information or correction by passages which may have escaped his notice.

Quotations from the English Bible are made in almost every case from the American Standard Version, which seems to have some peculiar excellences, especially in preserving the Divine Memorial Name, with which we have become familiarized under the form JEHOVAH.

It may seem to some that the present work should have included a discussion of the Temple Vision of Ezekiel, and of its ritual service. The writer has however decided otherwise, and for this reason. The Vision follows upon an extended prophecy (chs. xxxvi.-xxxix.), the fulfilment of which is evidently still in the future. The presumption is that the Temple Vision also refers to a future event or condition. Both prophecy and vision we believe will find their fulfilment when the Messianic Kingdom is about to be set up or is actually established in the earth. The full use and content of these Scriptures can scarcely then be understood at the present time. They do not record historical events, like the other writings which we consider in this book, but they are concerned with things still to come. For the present, therefore, we do not feel able to interpret their meaning, and we only refer to the sacrificial arrangements of the Temple of Ezekiel's Vision, when they appear to illustrate the use of the tabernacle.

It is too much to expect that the writer has altogether avoided inaccuracies ; he hopes, however, that they are few, and that there are no internal inconsistencies or mere flights of fancy in his interpretations. But he will always welcome criticisms where he has departed from or gone beyond the plain and natural sense of the writings which are being studied.

With these few words of explanation he commends this piece of work, brought to a conclusion with some difficulty and hesitation owing to the overshadowing of The Great War, to the candid and sympathetic consideration of the reader. He gratefully acknowledges the advice and encouragement which he has received from several friends, and to one whose generosity has made the publication of this book possible he tenders his hearty thanks. This liberal gift has enabled the writer to devote whatever returns there may be from the sale of the book to the work of the Church Missionary Society in Ningpo.

Finally the writer lifts his labours upon the Sacred Volume as an offering to God, in thanksgiving for the Word of His Grace, and relying upon the mediation of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

November, 1914.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
I. Introductory	I
II. The Beginnings	II
III. The Redemption	19
IV. The Salvation	32
V. The Covenant	42
VI. The Presence of God	55
VII. The Tabernacle and Altar	67
VIII. The Priesthood	97
IX. Tabernacle, Altar, and Priest like Christ	112
X. A Fourfold Picture	146
XI. The Burnt-offering or Acceptance	169
XII. The Sacrifice of Peace-offerings, or Fellowship	196
XIII. The Sin-offering or Atonement	228
XIV. The Day of Atonement	258
XV. The Trespass-offering or Restitution	277
XVI. The Meal-offerings and Drink-offerings or Human Service	288
XVII. Some Special Offerings	308
XVIII. Conclusion	354
Appendix	361
Index of Subjects	401

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

IT is necessary at the outset to define the limits of the present enquiry. I may say at once that the reliability of the Five Books of Moses is assumed; that is to say, that the enquiry will take it for granted that statements of facts made in those books are trustworthy, and our investigation will proceed on that understanding. For example, when it stands recorded that the pattern of the Tabernacle and its arrangements was shown to Moses on Mount Sinai, this is accepted as a fact, and conclusions are drawn from it. Or when the record states that Jehovah called to Moses, and spoke to him out of the Tent of Meeting, and gave him certain directions about sacrifices, the statement is accepted as it stands. In short, these books will be taken as reliable authorities for our knowledge of the subject which we are examining.

When it is necessary to illustrate the Law of Offerings laid down in these books from the after-history of the Israelitish nation, the same assumption will be extended to the historical and prophetic Books of the Old Testament. We will accept their statements as they stand, and not turn aside to question their date and authorship and consequent reliability or otherwise. This course is deliberately adopted. It does not *necessarily* imply any judgment upon what are so often described as the assured results of criticism, by which the Books of Moses are shown not to have been Books of Moses at all, and the Law of Offerings contained in them to have been a creation of later ages, ascribed to Moses and to Divine direction simply as a literary artifice, or with some other purpose. I say that it is quite possible for anyone to hold this view, and yet to bear with a discussion which proceeds on another hypothesis. For one way of testing the proof of a proposition is to assume the opposite, and observe the conclusions to which the assumption leads us. To any reader who may feel uncertain where the truth lies in

this matter, and who is unfitted to follow the dissertations of learned men and to form an independent judgment on their conclusions, the course which is followed in this study is recommended. Let us assume that we have in the Old Testament what it professes to give, the trustworthy record of a progressive Divine Revelation. Let us test our assumption now at this special point, where we read of the construction of a Tabernacle and the institution of a Law of sacrificial worship. Let us fearlessly examine every paragraph and every detail of the record; let us see whether it is consistent with itself; let us consider whether it fits in to the assumed line of Revelation, or contradicts it in any particular. We will start with no theory of how things ought to have been, but simply enquire what they are recorded to have been. We will do our best to give full weight to each statement, and to interpret it in its plain and natural sense. This will be our purpose and method; and if our assumption is incorrect while our reasoning is sound, we shall infallibly be landed sooner or later in an absurdity or in confusion. If, on the other hand, our investigation, proceeding on the assumption which I have outlined, leads us into no absurdity or contradiction, but rather exhibits wonderful anticipations and unlooked-for harmonies in the record, the probability of that assumption being true will be greatly increased. We shall be all the more inclined to apply it to other parts of the record, and finding the same result everywhere, we may be led by the methods of the plain man to a conviction of its truth, and a happy certainty that in the Holy Scriptures we possess in very deed the record of a progressive Divine Revelation, handed down to us in adequately trustworthy documents.

So then all that is asked of the reader is to allow this assumption to form the basis of our study. Nothing further is claimed for it at this point. In all that follows it may be looked upon merely as a working hypothesis, but it will be applied everywhere unreservedly, and without apology or argument. We will trust ourselves to it implicitly, and see whither it leads us. When we have followed its guidance through this portion of the Old Testament we shall be in a better position to estimate its general correctness.

The adoption of this hypothesis will relieve us of the necessity of investigating the origin of sacrificial worship. It will be sufficient to remember that the first sacrifice recorded is that of Cain and Abel,¹ and that at an even earlier date

¹ Gen. iv.

*Jehovah God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins, and clothed them*¹. These words, read in their connection with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden, and the probability that our first parents did not at that time use animal food, may be held to point to the first institution of animal sacrifices. The statement will certainly be full of significance if this is the true meaning of the brief record. We read that when Adam and Eve became self-conscious, they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons. Fearing to meet God, they hid themselves amongst the trees of the garden. From this shelter they were called to an exposure of their sin and of its consequences; but even before their punishment was announced to the guilty pair, there was uttered the first promise of their Deliverer. The Tempter had indeed seduced and involved the Human Race, but he had not obtained the mastery over them. *I will put enmity between thee and the woman, ran the Divine decree, and between thy seed and her seed; he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.* Read in the light of the developed history of redemption, we cannot mistake the reference of these words to the human conflict with sin divinely maintained, the advent of a Deliverer, born of woman, and to His suffering and final victory. But even in the cloudy and dark day when they were spoken, we may well believe that they were further emphasized in the hearing of man, and we have a not obscure intimation that they became at once the object of Adam's hope. *The man, we read, called his wife's name Eve* (i.e. *Living or Life*), *because she was the mother of all living.* The man, that is, who had just heard the awful words, *Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife unto dust shalt thou return,* at once calls her name Life, because she was the mother of all living. In a true sense the author of death, yet by Divine Promise marked out as the mother of life, Adam looks for seed from this woman, who shall destroy the works of the devil, and restore the hope of life. Adam was condemned to death, but not without promise of life through a human Deliverer, who should pass through suffering to victory. And then, exactly at this point, we read of animal death and of Jehovah concerned in it, and of Adam and his wife symbolically sheltered under it in the presence of Jehovah. Some animals then and there laid down their lives, God took their skins, and with them clothed the shrinking and condemned pair. Is it going beyond what is written to gather

¹ Gen. III. 21.

that at this time God joined with the first word of prophecy the first prophetic symbol? and that the origin of the world-wide custom of animal sacrifice is to be found here at the fountain-head of the human race? The close of the chapter seems to carry on the thought of life won for men by death. Adam and Eve are excluded from the tree of life, and the flame of a sword turns every way to guard the approaches to it. But serene and secure within the garden of Eden are placed the Cherubim, forms human in appearance,¹ to be a pledge that mankind shall in due time have access again to the tree of life. All the while the gate to life is shown to be through an avenue of death. May we not conclude that it was in trustful obedience to a Divine command that Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock and the fatlings thereof? If so we can understand the reference in Hebrews to his faith; and imagine how Cain on the other hand saw nothing in the coats of skins and flaming sword, and was in fact destitute of faith. One brother feared sin while the other had no conception of its danger,² but was content to do ill and to bring a mere present to Jehovah of the fruits of the ground.

But there is no need to press this point further. If the conclusions which have been drawn do not appear to be warranted by the record, they may be dismissed. We find at all events that sacrifice was the first act of Noah when with his family he stepped out from the ark to become the new head of the race. And we find a law, or at least a custom of sacrifice, in the statement that he took of every clean beast and every clean bird and offered burnt-offerings. Evidently certain beasts and birds were, at that time, regarded as clean or suitable for sacrifice. This may indicate the tradition of a Divine law, or it may point simply to a recognized custom. The custom, however, if it was only such, and not based on a previous command, was adopted and sanctioned by God Himself in His directions to Noah before he entered the ark.³ Now this single fact that Noah was accustomed to offer burnt-offerings to God, and that from his descendants the whole earth was overspread, is sufficient to account for the

¹ In Holy Scripture the Cherubim are clearly not actual existences but symbolic forms. Their aspect is not described anywhere in the Books of Moses, although we may gather with tolerable certainty that in the Tabernacle they were of human form but winged. It seems likely that in Eden also they were of this form, and that in both places they symbolized the Human Race. In the later visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and St. John their form is complex and varied, and symbolizes the whole animate creation, of which Man is the head and the crown.

² See Gen. iv. 7.

³ Gen. vii. 2.

universal practice of animal sacrifice by the human race. It is a point of contact between our records and universal experience which is of great interest and importance, and it opens up a wide field of enquiry. Upon this, however, we cannot enter. In the Appendix the conception of Sacrifice which prevailed amongst one race in the far east of Asia more than two thousand years ago is briefly discussed. It may serve as an illustration of the way in which the testimony of our records is found to be in agreement with experience. But whatever may be thought about pre-Mosaic rules of sacrifice, it is at all events quite clear from our authorities that the Mosaic Law of offerings is of Divine origin, and it is with this that we are chiefly concerned.

As we learn more of the condition of those nations from the midst of whom Abraham was called, and of the tribes amongst whom the patriarchs and Moses lived, we may find in their rules of sacrifice many points of contact with the Mosaic ritual. These agreements may be regarded as common survivals of a primitive law, but there is no need to insist on this being the case. We may well leave the question, as Scripture leaves it, undecided. The point is that when these rites were adopted in the Mosaic Law they acquired Divine sanction, and became part of the Divine system. If we wish to understand their significance, we must study them in the place they now occupy, not in the position they held in heathen systems. The geological history of the stone in a quarry is a legitimate and interesting subject of enquiry, but it can throw little light on the place which a stone from that quarry occupies after the architect has shaped and fitted it into a building. If a certain ritual existed in old Semitic rites, and is also found in the law given by Moses, we must study it in its place in the Divine Fabric, and not as it lay in the heathen system. This principle applies also to personal histories embedded in the Divine Records. It may be interesting to enquire who and what Melchisedek was. But if we wish to understand the place he holds in Scripture, we must fix our attention on the description of him given there. We may now feel sure from outside sources of information alone that he was a real man of his time. We have known all along from our authorities¹ that he was in the Scriptural representation *made like unto the Son of God*. God took that stone out of its quarry, shaped it to His purpose,

¹ Heb. vii. 3.

and built it into the appropriate place in the house which He was slowly building up. The principle applies also to other than sacrificial rites, the ritual of circumcision, for example. We do not need to enquire into the ideas attached to this custom by surrounding nations at the time of Abraham, but we consider its significance as adopted by God in connection with the whole scheme of revelation. When our Lord adopted the rite of Baptism, which was a Jewish ordinance, or took Bread and Wine from the Passover Supper and instituted the Lord's Supper, we need not go to Jewish ideas to understand the use of these elements in the rites of the Christian Church. So that whatever has come to light already, or may hereafter be discovered, as to the rock from which they were hewn, the rites of the sacrificial law of Moses concern us solely now in the place which they occupy in the record of the progressive Divine Revelation.

Following our authorities we claim Divine authorship for the ritual of the Mosaic Law, and as a consequence we may look for a threefold result.

In the first place the ritual must have been suited to the times when it was given, for God cannot perpetrate an anachronism. We cannot think that such a ritual would form part of a Divine revelation at the present stage of the world's history. But it was adapted to the stage of development which under Divine guidance the Israelites had then reached, and it formed part of the education of Israel for their world-wide mission. If it was to have its full effect upon them at the time, it must have spoken to them in language which they could understand. It was almost inevitable then that it should adopt some current practices of sacrificial worship, but regulate them so as to be the vehicle of truth, not error. At the same time the conveyance of truth was not the sole end and purpose of the sacrificial law. It was so framed as to promote their practical holiness, whether by the apprehension of the truths symbolized, or by the summons to trustful obedience to a commandment at the time not fully understood.

Secondly we shall look for Divine perfection in detail and in the mutual correspondence of the various laws. God's work in revelation is analogous to His work in Nature. Since both are really His, we must expect to find in both not only that adaptation to environment of which we have already spoken, which is so evident in nature, but also the same perfection of detail and correlation of parts. There may be the

same difficulty in tracing these which is often experienced by natural philosophers ; but if we are careful and reverent in our study, we may expect to find minute correspondence, and above all a ruling Idea, which at once binds each to each, and comprehends all in one embrace. If it is true that Creation is centred in Christ, as we believe that it is,¹ the creation by God of a Law of Sacrifice will be found to centre in Him also.

This is indeed the third result which follows from conceding Divine authorship to the sacrificial law of Moses. Not only does the advent of the Son of God contribute an adequate, and perhaps the only really adequate reason which can be given for such an intervention of God as is here supposed, but this is the known end and goal of all the previous revelation,² and so no doubt of this also. We know from former promises in the garden of Eden, as well as to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that the choice of Abraham's seed was for the express purpose of preparing the way for Him in whom the Deceiver would be overcome, and all nations of the earth would be blessed. And the history of the seed of Abraham so far had been "made like" the history of mankind. From the simplicity of patriarchal faith and obedience they had gone far astray. Serving idols in Egypt, slaves of an alien and cruel power, with no power to free themselves from the bondage, yet cherishing amongst themselves the promise of an inheritance in Canaan as the people of Jehovah—they had, in the Divine providence, been made like the race whose Deliverer was destined to spring from among them. In the wonders of their deliverance from this hopeless thralldom, who can fail to see a true picture of the great salvation to be wrought by the promised Saviour of the human race? And so Israel was brought out of Egypt, and was made ready for the next stage of Divine preparation. For a whole year they encamped under Sinai, and there were taught the great lesson of the holiness of God, and of His fiery law, and of how a sinful nation might draw near to Him. Here then, just when the sinner's approach to a holy God in a Tent of Meeting was the subject of the Divine education, offerings were definitely authorized and enjoined as the means of access. Can we fail to perceive that the adoption and regulation, and (as we shall also see) the addition to existing rites of sacrifice, was with a

¹ Col. 1. 16.

² This will be illustrated somewhat in detail in succeeding chapters. In the present chapter it is no more than glanced at.

view to the work of the true Deliverer, Reconciler, and Atoner? If the record of Melchisedek was so inserted as to make him a true likeness of the Son of God, how much more may we conclude that the object of the Mosaic Ritual was to make the general truth that God must be approached by offerings of propitiation more clear and definite, and so afford a more detailed and elaborated picture of the work of Christ by which man is brought near to God? This great work is indeed here taken up, and under a series of ritual actions symbolized in detail. We have noticed that the arrangements are adapted to the times when they were made, and that they were calculated to have an immediate practical influence upon Israel. But this does not in the least detract from their main intention and their permanent value. The Mosaic Law of offerings has a permanent value in the Christian Church, because from it we may learn a Divine philosophy of the work of Christ, that central fact of the world's history, the Incarnation, Dying, and Rising again of our blessed Lord, the immediate effect of which is to reconcile man to God, and its final issue to restore all things.

If the Law of Offerings does not contain such a philosophical analysis of the work of Christ, we look for it in vain elsewhere in the history of revelation. But that history may be expected to have something to satisfy every type of mind. The instinct for system and analysis which exists in many minds is a reflection of the Mind of God. God is Light, and the mind which humbly seeks for light upon the complicated reasons and manifold effects of this supreme work of God, will surely not be left without guidance.

It may seem natural to look for an ordered statement of the work of Christ in the New Testament; but a little reflection will show that the Divine plan is different; and here, as everywhere else, God's thoughts are higher than our thoughts, and His ways than our ways. It is a far more convincing display of the wisdom and knowledge of God to find, as we do find, that the work of Christ was minutely analysed in prophetic picture long before Christ appeared. In the New Testament we find simply the record of the Incarnate Christ, and the bearing of this history upon life and duty, and here and there some glimpses into its eternal issues. But for an ordered account of the philosophy of redemption we look in vain. Even the Epistle to the Romans, which comes nearest to a philosophical treatise, is no real exception. The close and ordered reasoning of the first eight chapters is rather a

statement of the need for redemption, and the assertion of its accomplishment in Christ, than an analysis of the work itself. And the Epistle to the Hebrews, though it again and again makes use of the prophetic picture to illustrate the work of Christ, is mainly directed to make men strong at a crisis of change by the vision of Jesus at the right hand of God. This book, however, is a notable example of the custom of New Testament writers in general. Their constant practice, following the Evangelist of the Old Testament¹ and our Lord Himself,² is to point readers back to the sacrificial scheme of Moses for insight into the work of Christ. It was significant when the first announcement of the Saviour's near approach was made to a priest within the Temple.³ It was more significant still when the great Forerunner, uniting in himself the double line of preparation by priest and prophet, testified of Jesus, *Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.* And St. Paul,⁴ St. Peter,⁵ St. John,⁶ as well as that great Vision in the Apocalypse where the Lord Himself appears under the figure of a Lamb as though it had been slain,⁷ unite in pointing us to the Law of Offerings for an understanding of the work of Christ. The passages quoted from the three great Apostolic writers are but examples of an ever-present train of thought. And it is specially noticeable that they not only regard the law of animal sacrifice as in a general way foreshadowing the redemptive work of Christ, but they draw special attention in this respect to the particulars and minutiae of the ritual. St. John tells us that the crucifixion of Christ came about as it did *that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken.*⁸ St. Paul shows the significance of the feast of unleavened bread following upon the Passover.⁹ But most striking of all is the premiss that underlies the argument of the writer to the Hebrews. *Every high priest, he says, is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it is necessary that this high priest also have somewhat to offer.*¹⁰ Why should it be necessary that Christ should answer to the appointments for high priests of old, unless they had indeed been made like the Son of God? But this is the constant underlying assumption of the writer, and we do well to notice how thoroughly it is

¹ Is. LIII. 10, marg.

² Mark x. 45; Luke xxii. 15, 16.

³ Not less significant was the fact, which Edersheim asserts in his "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," that the flocks which pastured near Bethlehem were those destined for Temple sacrifices.

⁴ 1 Cor. v. 7.

⁵ 1 Pet. i. 19.

⁶ 1 John i. 7.

⁷ Apoc. v. 6.

⁸ John xix. 36.

⁹ 1 Cor. v. 8.

¹⁰ Heb. viii. 3.

✓ taken for granted. We may find analogies to the work of Christ in the customs of priests of ethnic religions, but we can assert no necessity for a parallel to them in the work of Christ. But the Mosaic Law of Offerings stands in a different category, and must find its fulfilment in Christ. The same argument is applied even to the minutiae of ritual in ch. XIII. 11, 12, where we read, *The bodies of those beasts whose blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest as an offering for sin, are burnt without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people through His own blood, suffered without the gate.* The Lord Jesus suffered without the gate, because the ritual of the sin-offering had prescribed that the bodies of its victims should be brought without the camp. This necessity of fulfilment could only be if there was a designed correspondence between the two; and this indeed there is, so that we may confidently assert that the one was made like the other, and that here also not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law until the whole design is unfolded in its fulfilment.

This then we have found to be the Divine plan; to give all materials for an analysis, to point out where those materials are stored, but to leave research to those who delight in the works of God. The works of the Lord are great, sought out by all those who have pleasure therein. Personal salvation indeed does not depend on our power of analysing the component parts of the redemptive work of Christ; it is conditioned alone by faith in the redeeming Person. But at the same time an enquiry into that redemptive work, as pictured in the sacrifices, and the ordered apprehension of that work, strengthens faith and quickens love and hope. To such an ordered apprehension, so far as it may be attained, of a work which passes knowledge, and to such deepened faith and hope and love towards our Saviour may this humble enquiry lead.

CHAPTER II.

THE BEGINNINGS.

IT has been asserted above that all revelation previous to the promulgation of a Sacrificial Law was directed towards the advent of Christ. The record of this revelation is preserved to us in the Books of Genesis and Exodus, and the object of this and the following chapters is to illustrate this statement from those books. The effect of this brief survey will be, it is hoped, to prepare our minds still further for the Gospel teaching in the Sacrificial Law, which we have already seen to be a reality. ✓

The Book of Genesis has been called the Bible of Moses. We find in it unmistakable indications of the existence of documents which contain, at least in some instances, contemporary records of the Divine manifestations.¹ These documents, whether selected and compiled by Moses himself, or at an earlier date, were his authorities for the knowledge of the previous course of revelation, and so may be said to have been his Bible.

In the first section of this Book,² we find the origin of all visible things, Man included, traced to the volition and the power of a personal Almighty Being. The connection of the human race with the material world and with the rest of the animal creation is clearly marked; indeed Man is shown to be the topstone of this building and the goal of its upward progress. But Man was not only this; he was made also in the image of God, and so placed in a relationship with the unseen world and with his Creator altogether special and unique. Here we find already the foundations laid, the scene, as it were, prepared for a history of human intercourse with God and final satisfaction in God. Is it too much to say that we see also the necessary preparatory conditions for a future Incarnation of the Divine Nature? ✓

¹ See II. 4; v. 1, "This is the book of the generations of Adam"; vi. 9; x. 1; xl. 10; xl. 27; xxv. 12; xxv. 19; xxxvi. 1; xxxvi. 9; xxxvii. 2.

² Chs. I.-II. 3.

In the next section¹ our attention is concentrated upon the story of Man. Human intercourse with God is, as the first section led us to suppose it would be, actually enjoyed. But this happy condition is not maintained. The express command of God is disobeyed, and the threatened consequences follow. The Seducer to whom Man listened rather than to his Creator is permitted to remain as the perennial Enemy of mankind. Upon man and upon woman is laid a load of toil and pain. Exclusion from the garden of delight and a final return to dust is the sentence upon those who had enjoyed unfettered intercourse with God and constant access to a tree of life. Envy, murder, godlessness, licence, ribaldry enter into the family of man. But out of all this darkness there rises that light which is to shine more and more as revelation constantly draws back the veil. In this section we hear first of Jehovah. It is difficult not to accept the conclusion, however difficult it may be to demonstrate it, that this title is connected with the primeval Promise of the Woman's Seed. Throughout this section the God of creation becomes the Jehovah God of redemption and of hope. He it is who gives the Promise, which fills Adam with such hope that he calls his wife's name Living or Life. He it is who makes for Adam and his wife coats of skins and clothes them. He it is who while He drove them out from Eden yet placed within it in their sight human forms of Cherubim, as a pledge that He would find out a way for their return. Some one was evidently *to be*, born of the woman, who would reverse the Fall and bruise the serpent's head. It has seemed to many that "He shall be" became almost a personal name with reference to the Coming One. At least the words which immediately follow the account of the expulsion from Eden are deeply significant if read in this sense. *And the man knew Eve² his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man, even Jehovah, the Coming One.* But the after-history shows how mistaken was this idea, and the section closes with the significant and moving words, *Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah*, as if they gave up the immediate hope of a human deliverer, but clung to the promise of a deliverance, and called upon Jehovah God to fulfil His promise and save them.

The third section,³ which is entitled *the Book of the genera-*

¹ Chs. II. 4-IV. 26.

² This name occurs in the O.T. only here and in ch. III. 20. Its use here is certainly significant if the verse is to be interpreted as above. Contrast ch. IV. 25.

³ Chs. V.-VI. 8.

tions of Adam, appears to be intended as a brief record of the persistence of primitive tradition in the human race. It repeats the salient fact that Man was created in the likeness of God, and it contains the notice of Enoch's walk with God and being taken to God. It records also Lamech's humble spirit, and reverent recollection of the circumstances of the Fall. It makes it clear further that the Memorial Name¹ Jehovah was known to him, and therefore also, we may conclude, the Promise with which it was connected. But it shows as clearly that the slender stream of piety and faith and with it the whole human race was in danger of extinction, had not the faithful Promiser intervened. The section closes, like the last, upon the Name Jehovah. *Jehovah said, I will destroy man . . . but Noah found favour in the eyes of Jehovah.* Here is already a picture, though at present dim and indistinct, of salvation by grace. In this section there is no mention of Noah's righteous walk with God, but all the emphasis is laid upon the favour of Jehovah, by which alone any man is rescued from the general ruin.

In the following section,² *the generations of Noah*, we come for the first time upon that which is so frequent in the later stages of revelation, namely, the taking of a man or of a situation, and so dealing with him or with it as to form a picture of the work of Christ. In this passage the greatest stress is laid upon the righteousness of Noah, by which he saved his house, and became the head of a new race in a new world. It is impossible to doubt that all this took place as it did, and was recorded as it has been recorded, with reference to the work of Christ. This Righteous Man in this picture offers also an acceptable burnt-offering, and is the recipient of an everlasting covenant, in which he is made still further like the Son of God. And yet we are conscious that we are reading the contemporary account of a real event in all the story of the Flood. The history of Noah's shame increases the impression that this is not allegory but history. Yet we feel conscious also that this history is appended to the section not on its own account but because Noah's fall became the occasion for the first prophecy of the future. The rhythmical words of Noah, in which he foretold the future of his descendants, are

¹ Gen. v. 29. After the great manifestation of deliverance from Egypt this was the constant appellation of the Name Jehovah. Ex. iii. 15; Ps. xxx. 4; xcvi. 12; cii. 12; cxxxv. 13; Hosea xii. 5. But we believe that it has been from the beginning a memorial of the primeval promise, of the fulfilment of which the deliverance from Egypt was a signal type.

² Chs. vi. 9-ix. 29.

the only words of that preacher of righteousness which have been preserved to us. They make mention of the Memorial Name which Noah had learned from his father, and they foretell a special connection of the God of the Promise with the family of Shem. We see then in the section the commencement of those twin lines of Type and Prophecy which as we know converge through all the history of revelation steadily upon the Christ. But in this we anticipate.

The next section¹ gives a summary account of the descendants of Noah, and of the way in which the God of the Promise scattered them abroad upon the face of the whole earth, having, in His providence, designed to be the God of Shem. It is quite possible, in the light of the developed and completed story, that the prophecy of Noah in the preceding section should be read as a prediction that God would *dwell in the tents of Shem ;*² and that the *coming down*³ of Jehovah to see the city and the tower which men built, and to scatter them from it, was in view of His coming down at Pentecost to reunite those whom for a small moment⁴ He had forsaken, and to build for them the true city and tower, from which they should be scattered no more. At least we may concede that this section has a peculiar appropriateness in suggesting these thoughts.

But now the record centres itself upon the history of Shem, *These are the generations of Shem,*⁵ and hastens towards the history of Abraham. The line of Shem is first traced to Terah, the father of Abraham,⁶ and then commences a new and extended section⁷ entitled *the generations of Terah*, but containing as its main subject the history of Abraham.

The arrangement of the remainder of the Book beginning with the Abrahamic section makes it quite clear that its object is the history of the Promise and of its development. Abraham is called out first from his native land and then from his father's house, to be the recipient of the Promise. That Promise contained certain elements which referred specially to himself and to his natural seed, but there is an unmistakable reference to the primeval hope of mankind in the words, *In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*⁸ And that this is so is expressly stated by God Himself, when the two angels and Jehovah walked towards Sodom, and Abraham went with them to bring them on the way. *Shall I hide from Abraham that*

¹ Chs. x.-xi. 9.

⁴ Is. liv. 7.

⁷ Chs. xi. 27-xxv. 11.

² Ch. ix. 27, marg.

⁵ Ch. xi. 10.

⁸ Ch. xii. 1-3.

³ Ch. xi. 5.

⁶ Ch. xi. 10-26.

which I do, said Jehovah, *seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I have known¹ him, to the end that he may command his children and his household after him, that they may keep the way of Jehovah, to do righteousness and justice, to the end that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.*² This then is the object of the choice of Abraham. The God of the Promise was to be his God, and the God of his descendants, until the Seed came to whom the Promise was made. Accordingly we find that the history of those descendants of Abraham who were outside the line of this purpose is briefly dismissed,³ while attention is confined to the histories of Isaac⁴ and of Jacob,⁵ to each of whom in succession the great Promise was renewed, in one case to the exclusion of Ishmael, and in the other to the exclusion of Esau.⁶

But it is when we pass in review the dealings of God with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob that we are entirely convinced that they all took place, and were all recorded, with a view to the advent of the promised Saviour. It is scarcely too much to say that there is no truth now revealed to us about the Saviour, or about the Way of Salvation, which is not foreshadowed in the histories of the patriarchs as recorded in Genesis.

It is not only that what had been dimly recognized before as to a mysterious plurality of Persons in the Godhead became now more distinct. The older records had spoken of counsels of God with God.⁷ But now a plainer manifestation was made of a Messenger of God who was Himself Divine.⁸ Nay more, this Jehovah Himself appeared in human form. The Judge of all the earth comes to Abraham as a Friend, and eats and drinks with him, and treads with him the roads of Canaan.⁹ From this Person the patriarchs wait for their salvation,¹⁰ but they expect also that the Peace-giver shall be born from their descendants.¹¹

But even more striking are the foreshadowings of this Person who is to be, brought about evidently not by chance but by the hand of God.

¹ I.e. I have chosen him, selected him, and shown him favour; cf. Amos III. 2.

² Ch. XVIII. 16-19.

³ See "the generations of Ishmael, Abraham's son" (ch. xxv. 12-18), and "the generations of Esau" (ch. xxxvi. 1-8), and "the generations of Esau in Mount Seir" (chs. xxxvi. 9-xxxvii. 1).

⁴ Chs. xxv. 19-xxxv. 29.

⁶ Chs. xxvi. 4, and xxviii. 14.

⁹ Ch. xviii.

⁵ Chs. xxxvii. 2-L.

⁷ Ch. i. 26.

⁸ Chs. xvi. and xxii.

¹⁰ Ch. xlix. 18.

¹¹ Ch. xlix. 10.

There is in Isaac the picture of a son long looked and waited for, and born at last, not in the ordinary course of nature, but by an exercise of Divine power, and in fulfilment of a Divine promise. He is intended to be an only son, and in spite of human interference he is marked as such by the expulsion of Ishmael. This only son, beloved by his father, willingly lays down his life; and on the third day, as it were, receives it again.

There is in Joseph the picture of a brother marked out for rule, hated of his brethren, sold to foreigners, falsely accused, three years (apparently) immured, exalted to the right hand of authority, saviour of the nations and finally of his own family.

There is the figure of one who is both King and Mediator between God and men. He appears in the record as one whose Kingship and Priesthood alike are without beginning and without end. He receives his powers from no one, and transmits them to no one. He blesses the people of God, receives their homage, and supplies their needs.

These instances are but the extension of what had already taken place in the history of Noah, and the anticipation of what was to be repeated throughout the course of Revelation.

The great truths of the Gospel that Christ laid down His life as a ransom for many, and that His perfect righteousness has secured our justification,¹ are both anticipated in this wonderful Book. God prepared a ram to be offered up *in the stead of Isaac*, and the blessing was entailed to Isaac *because that Abraham obeyed My voice, and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes, and My laws.*² It is remarkable that this entail of blessing from father to son is mentioned in the Old Testament only in connection with Abraham and with David,³ and we remember that Christ is called *the son of David, the son of Abraham.*⁴

Even the localities connected with the advent of the Saviour are already indicated. We find the priest-king ruling in Jerusalem; we find the Only Beloved Son offered up upon Moriah. There is also a connection of the Seed of Promise with Egypt.

And when we read the life-histories of the heirs of grace, how close is the correspondence with the full-developed gospel. The foundation truth of God's sovereign choice is repeatedly forced upon our notice. Abraham may have been distinguished from his contemporaries by greater purity of belief and

¹ Mark x. 45; Rom. v. 10, 19.

³ 1 Kings xi. 34.

² Gen. xxii. 13 and xxvi. 5.

⁴ Matt. i. i.

practice, but there is nothing in the record to say so. Just as in a former section we saw that Noah's rescue from the general ruin was traced solely to the favour of Jehovah, so the root of Abraham's blessing is not found in anything in himself, but in the choice and call of God; and the same truth is emphasized in the histories of Isaac and of Jacob. Abraham as a matter of history is the ancestor of all monotheistic religion in the world to-day, and specially of the Christian Church. All that we know of his history is contained in the Book of Genesis; and that history will be found to illustrate every aspect of the Christian life. Here is, as we have pointed out, the sovereign choice of God, and the effectual call of God. Here is that grand Christian characteristic of faith, which obeys God's call and follows Him. Here is bare faith in God obtaining the gift of justification. Here we see this faith being tested, and bearing its fruit of implicit obedience. We see too in Abraham the true likeness of a pilgrim passing through the world without obtaining the promise he had been taught to look for.¹

We see him impressing upon others the fear of God and habits of prayer. We notice that while he has fellowship with God, and lives out his life amongst men with nobility and uprightness, yieldingness and courtesy, he all the while maintains his separateness from them. There are indeed in this wonderful Book weaker saints than Abraham, but they are stamped with the same characteristics, and are enabled not to lose their faith but to endure to the end. Ay, and we are led to feel that when we have lost sight of the pilgrims it is not their end. The premature close of Abel's life and the comparative shortness of Enoch's pilgrimage must have been a powerful witness to the existence of a life beyond, even if there was no direct revelation on the subject. Moreover, both Abraham and Jacob at least had ocular demonstration of the existence of angels and of another than this mortal scene. It is not obscurely intimated in their contemporary annals, and it is definitely stated by the writer to the Hebrews, that they looked for a heavenly country and heavenly city. In the phrase of the ancient record, when they died they were *gathered to their people*.² And the promise of a resurrection

¹ This truth is emphasized at all important epochs of the history of the Church: first in Abraham's history, and distinctly mentioned in Gen. xxiii. 4; next on settling in Egypt, Gen. xlvii. 9; then, successively, on the entry into Canaan, Lev. xxv. 23; the establishment of the monarchy, 1 Chron. xxix. 15; cf. Ps. xxxix. 12; at the captivity, Ps. cxix. 19, 54; and under the Christian dispensation, Heb. xi. and 1 Pet. i. 17; ii. 11, etc.

² The exact phrase "to be gathered to his people" is peculiar to the Books of Moses. It is used of Abraham (Gen. xxv. 8), Isaac (Gen. xxxv. 29), Jacob

was at least implicitly contained in the fact that God proclaimed Himself still to be their God as each successive patriarch was laid in the grave.¹ And this, taken in conjunction with the known fact that Enoch had been bodily translated to another life, may well have given to the patriarchs the hope of the resurrection of the flesh. But whether the truth was distinctly apprehended by them or not there is no need for us to decide. The important thing is to notice that in this portraiture of the believer the life of the world to come and the resurrection from the dead find their due place; and joining these to the history of Enoch we have a complete prophecy of the Christian hope, for we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed. And once more if we recall the symbol of the Cherubim placed in Eden hard by the tree of life, we learn that not only Man shall be restored, but that the lost Eden shall be brought back, and so the perfected Race shall live in a perfected environment.

And this is to be the work of One who is to come. In one striking picture of this book He shows Himself in act to come. Jacob, the heir of the promises, sleeps all alone on the cold ground. *And he dreamed; and, behold, a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and, behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am Jehovah . . . in thee and in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed.*

The world in Genesis is a real world, the actors are historical characters, the patriarchs are men of their time, but the Hand that guides their experiences and records their history is Divine, seeing that which is to come, and marking out the way of Jehovah.

(Gen. XLIX. 33), Aaron (Num. xx. 24, 26), and Moses (Num. xxvii. 13; xxxi. 2; Deut. xxxii. 50). It is also used of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 17), which is one of several indications that Ishmael, though excluded from the inheritance of Abraham in this world, remained a worshipper and servant of God, and was gathered to the people of God in the life of the world to come. The phraseology of two passages quoted above makes it plain that "to be gathered to his people" is an additional circumstance to dying or being buried (cf. esp. Gen. xxxv. 29). A similar though not identical phrase, "to be gathered to their fathers," is used of the generation of Israelite believers in Joshua's lifetime (Judg. ii. 7, 10), and again in God's promise to Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 20; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 28). In the latter case it is distinguished from being "gathered to the grave". The phrase which occurs so frequently in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, "to sleep with one's fathers," is neutral in character, being used indifferently of good and bad kings, and refers to closing the eyes on this world, and to repose of the body in the ancestral grave.

¹ See chs. xxvi. 24; xxviii. 13; xlvi. 3; and so Exod. iii. 6.

CHAPTER III.

THE REDEMPTION.

WE have seen in our brief sketch of the Book of Genesis how the whole course of the progressive revelation so far is directed towards the coming of a promised Deliverer, and how the experiences of the patriarchs are moulded on the pattern of the things to come.

At the end of that Book we find the guardians of the Promise by a chain of remarkable providences brought into a foreign land, and the record closes with the assurance twice repeated, *God will surely visit you, and bring you up out of this land unto the land which He sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.*¹ There is then a pause in the history of revelation, which lasted, according to different computations, either more than two hundred or more than four hundred years. The chronological question is not now important, but the pause, whether of longer or shorter duration, reminds us of the break in the long-continued stream of prophecy which followed the mission of Malachi, and which lasted for full four hundred years until the actual advent of the Redeemer.

So here Israel is brought into Egypt and left in expectation of an exodus, and of a visitation by God Himself. We may well anticipate that that visitation when it came would have a special significance, and continue to bear marked reference to the way of Jehovah. This anticipation is not disappointed. When at length the visitation takes place, we shall see that it is announced as a manifestation of the Memorial Name.² The former manifestations of God to the patriarchs had been demonstrations of His power, but in no case had they been brought into circumstances in which the redemptive purpose of God could be shown. The history of Joseph indeed showed that God sent him beforehand to preserve life,³ and the experiences of Jacob were felt by him to be a lifelong deliverance by the Divine Angel,³ but there had been so far no manifestation

¹ Gen. L. 24, 25.

² Exod. vi. 2-9.

³ Gen. xlv. 7; xlviii. 16.

of the purpose of God to *bruise the serpent's head*, which we have seen to be the direct occasion for the appellation Jehovah. But the descendants of the patriarchs have been brought into Egypt so that they may there come under the yoke of a foreign oppressor, and that there the Name of Jehovah may be made known to them by a great and unmistakable manifestation.

The Book of Exodus was, as we believe, the work of Moses. After a careful examination of the text there does not appear to be a single phrase that could not have been penned by him,¹ and there is much that could only have been written by one who was thoroughly conversant both with Egypt and with the Wilderness, not to say by an eye-witness of the scenes described, qualifications which could, we think, be united in no one else after the time of Moses. Besides which we have once and again the distinct mention of a book in which both historical events and Divine commandments were at the time inscribed by Moses.² These few considerations, selected from many others which might be advanced, are only referred to, in the absence of any direct statement of authorship in the Book itself, as supporting the evidence of tradition, and as supplying the Prophet for this great work of prophecy. We believe that there has not arisen in the course of the Divine revelation a fuller or a clearer picture of the way of Jehovah than is to be found in this Book of Exodus, in exact accordance with the history of the prophet whom we believe to have indited it, and of whom it is said *There has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face, in all the signs and the wonders, which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land, and in all the mighty hand, and in all the great terror, which Moses wrought in the sight of all Israel.*³ The memory of this Redemption was sufficient to proclaim God to be the Redeemer until the real Redemption came. The coming down which was inaugurated in the burning bush was sufficient manifestation of Jehovah until God became flesh and was named JESUS, Jehovah Saviour. There has only arisen one other Prophet in Israel comparable to Moses, and there is only one other Redemption like the redemption from Egypt.

To the history recorded in the Book of Exodus we must now turn our attention. We shall find that it leads us through

¹ Not excepting ch. xvi. 35, which may well have been written in "the borders of the land of Canaan," in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho, Num. xxxv. 1.

² Exod. xvii. 14; xxiv. 4; xxxiv. 27.

³ Deut. xxxiv. 10-12.

an avenue that is redolent of Jesus Christ to that which is the main subject of our study, the sacrificial law of Moses. It will enable us to reconstruct the scene where the picture prophecy of the ritual of offerings was acted. It will continue the revelation of The Coming One of which we have already traced the beginnings; it will emphasize truths which we shall afterwards find to be those truths precisely which it is the purpose of the Law of Offerings to illustrate and to enforce.

The history falls into three parts, each of which presents a distinct picture. The first¹ records the deliverance from Egypt, and forms a picture of Redemption. The second² describes the progress of the redeemed people from Egypt to the Mount of God, where they *beheld God and did eat and drink*; and illustrates the path of Salvation from redemption to glory. The third and last division³ narrates the way in which, by means of the Tabernacle and the Priesthood, God dwells amongst His people; and here we shall find that both Tabernacle and Priesthood are pictures of the Christ who mediates to us the Presence of God; and so we shall be prepared, nay more, we shall be irresistibly led on to see in the sacrificial worship of the Priesthood in the Tabernacle a picture of the work of Christ.

It will not be possible to do more than recall to the reader's mind the various incidents, which by their omissions no less than by their collocation tend to emphasize the leading truth of each section.

REDEMPTION.

CHS. I.-XIII.

The Book of Genesis records the fall of man from his original standing, and indicates not obscurely the impossibility of recovery by his own efforts. It has also stated plainly that "the imagination of his heart" is not directed towards recovery, but towards evil.

It is reserved, however, for this Book to illustrate his actual condition. At the opening of Exodus we find Israel far from their promised land, far also from the righteousness and faith of their fathers. We see them in the iron grasp of an inexorable bondage. They have not lost knowledge of their promised possession, but they have abandoned all hope of obtaining it. In fact they revile their would-be deliverer, when he rebukes their sinful strife. His efforts are in vain, not only from the strength

¹ Chs. I.-XIII.

² Chs. XIV.-XXIV. II.

³ Chs. XXIV. I2-XL.

of the oppressor, but even more from the servile temperament and wilful opposition of those whom he would save. But yet *they sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up to God, by reason of the bondage.* Where could the story of redemption be better illustrated than on such a people as this? What more apt picture of a fallen race, groaning under the tyranny of sin and of Satan, than Israel in Egypt? If Israel can be brought out of Egypt, then man can be redeemed from his low estate. But in both cases alike no other than divine power is adequate. The situation can only be met by God *coming down*,¹ not in the case of Israel by literal incarnation, but by a symbolic anticipation of that great event. Israel amongst the nations was in itself no more than one thorn-bush amongst countless others in the wilderness. Moreover, it was on fire, in *the iron furnace*,² and must surely be consumed. But it was not consumed, and Moses turned aside to see this great sight. Then and there out of the midst of the bush, afflicted as it were with the affliction of Israel, their Divine Deliverer appeared. He had heard their cry, He said, and was come down Himself to deliver them. The general course of the impending conflict was then revealed to Moses; and he was sent to summon Pharaoh to release God's people. The summons was first given in the form of a request to release the people to hold a religious feast. This summons was an appeal to the free-will of the oppressor; but it served only to bring his hatred, cruelty, and blasphemous pride into greater prominence; so that he became a realistic picture of the great Oppressor and implacable Enemy of mankind. The people gave up hope, and Moses himself was in despair. It was the time of man's extremity and of God's opportunity. The request was exchanged for an authoritative demand of final release. Jehovah said unto Moses, *Now shalt thou see what I will do to Pharaoh.*³ Let us follow, step by step, and see how Israel was redeemed.

First of all we have the solemn announcement of what is about to take place.⁴ The words of God are prefaced by the declaration *I am Jehovah*, and closed in the same way, *I am Jehovah*. We have already had occasion once and again to express our conviction that the Name Jehovah was applied to God with reference to His primeval promise to mankind. It had been all along the Memorial Name of the promised salvation. If this is so, the present passage presents no difficulties;

¹ Ch. III, 8.² Deut. IV, 20.³ Ch. VI, I.⁴ Exod. VI, 2-8.

on any other supposition much of it is difficult to explain, if it is not in direct contradiction to the earlier records. We assume then that the sacred title Jehovah was from ancient times the Memorial Name of salvation; and with this understanding the great Announcement, which should be compared with the announcement at the Call of Abraham,¹ may be paraphrased as follows: (1) God Almighty who had promised and fulfilled so much beyond nature to Abraham, God Almighty who had so wonderfully preserved Isaac from his enemies, and Jacob in all the calamities which he drew upon himself, had so far made no great demonstration of His redemptive purpose. *I appeared as God Almighty, but by My Name Jehovah I was not known to them.* (2) But God had made a covenant to give them the land of Canaan, and now their descendants were kept in Egypt in bondage, groaning under a hopeless servitude. (3) Wherefore this message was sent to them—I am the promised Saviour. I will bring you out; I will redeem you; I will take you for My people, and will be your God; and you shall know that I am your Saviour God. I will also bring you in to the promised land, and you shall inherit it. The promise is sure, and salvation is near, for I that speak to you am Jehovah. It seems impossible to take these words in any other sense than as an announcement that just then there was to be displayed a great Act of Redemption fulfilling, but not exhausting, the meaning of the primeval promise. The whole is as much as to say, I am about to show you an instance of Redemption. It is not the promised redemption indeed, for your present bondage is to the Egyptians and not to sin and death and Satan; and the promise now being fulfilled is one of an earthly Canaan, the land of your fathers' sojournings, not of a restored Eden. But—so far as it goes—it is a true revelation of the Memorial Name, and one which was not vouchsafed to your fathers, but which is given to you. Attend then and watch me while I work. Can we, with these words before us, doubt that the redemption from Egypt is intended by God to be prophetic of the redemption of mankind?

We notice then that the officers and elders of the children of Israel from this point onwards disappear from the scene, until the conflict is decided, and they are called upon to accept the deliverance which Jehovah has wrought for them.² There

¹ Gen. XII. 2, 3 with XVIII. 19.

² From chs. VI. 9 to XI. 2 and XII. 21 the people are not mentioned except as being under the special care of God,

follows a series of nine plagues in which we see Jehovah overthrowing all the power of the enemy. If we may so speak, the Redeemer of Israel comes to ever closer grips with the Oppressor. First he is inconvenienced, then he loses his possessions, next his followers suffer. Again by two successive blows his land is destroyed, and last of all his activities are stayed by a pall of thick darkness. The conflict is now virtually decided. To all but the oppressor himself it was obvious who was the stronger, the Redeemer or the Oppressor, and that Pharaoh could not retain the people if the attack was pressed home. But it is also deeply significant, in view of the great Redemption to be illustrated, that one more plague must be brought upon Pharaoh before deliverance can be offered to the people. There is no hint that the severity of this final plague changed Pharaoh's heart. In fact his heart was not changed, and very soon after the event he repented of having let the children of Israel go, and endeavoured to recover them to his service, just as he had done on former occasions. So far as Pharaoh's power of resistance was concerned, there is no reason why God should not have overborne his opposition much earlier, and without this final plague have released the people. But probably throughout a period of ten months there followed in slow succession these manifestations of the Redeemer's power and the Oppressor's impotent obstinacy, while Israel still remained in bondage. There may well have been reasons for the delayed deliverance in the circumstances of the people at the time. But there are deeper reasons in the typical aspect of the whole.

If we read attentively the record in Exodus, we shall find that the ineffectual character of the first nine plagues is strongly emphasized. The final effect of them is a fierce threat from Pharaoh to Moses, *Get thee from me, take heed to thyself, see my face no more ; for in the day thou seest my face thou shalt die ;*¹ and the net result, so far as deliverance is concerned, is summarized at the close of chapter XI. in the words, *And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before Pharaoh ; and Jehovah hardened Pharaoh's heart, and he did not let the children of Israel go out of his land.* What then is the meaning of this long procession of ineffectual wonders? They did not effect the redemption, but they bore witness to a three-fold truth ; that a stronger than Pharaoh is here, that He is Lord in heaven above and in the earth beneath, and that He is here for the salvation of Israel.

¹ Ch. x. 28.

The nine plagues are in this respect parallel to the miracle-working of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and the correspondence is so exact that it must be the result of design. The work of Jehovah in Egypt was made like the working of the Son of God in the world. If Jehovah showed Himself to be stronger than the fierce and powerful Pharaoh, so Jesus showed Himself stronger than the Strong Man who oppresses mankind. As the strokes in Egypt fell only upon Pharaoh and his people and his land, and not upon the people whom Jehovah had come to save, so no stroke of judgment fell upon any human being at the hands of Him who came to save men's lives and not to kill. He showed through all His life implacable enmity against all the power of the evil one,¹ but His shield was ever spread over mankind whom He came to save. Jehovah showed by His wonders in Egypt that He was Lord in heaven and earth. The Lord Jesus showed by His miracles that He was the Maker and Sustainer of all things, but by signs of love and not of fear. If Jehovah by Moses turned water into blood, Jesus turned water into wine. The Lord Jesus stilled and did not raise the storm; He multiplied instead of destroying the fishes; He gave bread instead of laying low the springing crops; He guided living creatures for good and not for evil; He healed instead of inflicting all manner of disease and death; instead of darkness, for the blind He turned night into day. But it is the same Hand, the same Power, the same Person visiting His people for their salvation. If Jehovah announced His purpose to redeem His people Israel, so the Lord Jesus was announced as He that should save His people from their sins. But even as the nine plagues upon Egypt and the shelter of Israel in Goshen were not the salvation, neither could the miracle-working of our Lord Jesus save mankind. Those were but the signs that Jehovah, the Covenant God, had come down to save Israel from Egypt; these were the signs that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world, Jehovah of the primeval promise.

The age-long conflict was virtually decided when God became manifest in the flesh. With sovereign power He proclaims deliverance to His people, *Thy sins be forgiven thee, go in peace*; but the victorious Human Life alone (like Jehovah's victories through Moses in Egypt) could not avail to set His people free. "He partook of death, that *through death* He might bring to nought him that had the power of

¹Luke x. 17-19.

death, that is the Devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage".¹ This supreme truth of redemption, the ruling truth from Genesis to Revelation, that Christ must die for our sins, was now to be fully illustrated. *Yet one more plague will I bring upon Pharaoh and upon Egypt; afterwards he will let you go hence;* or, as Moses said to Pharaoh, *Thus saith Jehovah, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt, and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, and after that, said Moses, I will go out.* Three whole chapters of the Book of Exodus are occupied with the recital of this great event,² where only five chapters have sufficed for the nine plagues preceding. So the recital of our Saviour's death occupies a large part of each Gospel history.

Now let us ponder this last plague of Egypt. We have seen that the transition to this is marked in the narrative by a summary of the work so far, and of its ineffectiveness to secure Israel's release, as well as by an intimation that this last stroke will secure the promised end. But besides this, an examination of the nine plagues shows, as has often been pointed out, that they form a complete series in themselves, and that the tenth stands separate and apart. The nine fall into three sets, each of greater severity than the last. Within each set we find that on the first two occasions the summons to release Israel was given, and the plague threatened to non-compliance. After two acts of disobedience and disregard of the sign, the third plague was inflicted without further option. It was announced as a punishment for perfidy and contumacy. And at the close of the second series of three plagues, after a long course of hardening his own heart, the additional punishment of judicial hardening by God is inflicted on Pharaoh. From that time forward, in the remaining stages of the conflict to his end in the waters of the Red Sea, he was strengthened in opposition, not only by his own perversity, but also by God, so as to give opportunity for the display of God's power to condemn and overthrow the strong Oppressor, and to save His people with the promised deliverance. It is obvious then from this internal connection, as well as from the form of the narrative, that the nine plagues are complete in themselves. The tenth plague stands separate and apart. So the whole of Scripture isolates the dying of the Saviour, as being not merely a continuation of His faithfulness even to

¹ Heb. II, 14, 15.

² Exs. XI., XII., XIII.

death, but as something more than this. The Death holds a unique position in His life; it is not merely the close of that life; it is rather its supreme and crowning work by which redemption is effected.

The events connected with the redemption of Israel from Egypt are recorded in Exodus XI.-XIII. They are in chronological order,¹ and comprise the announcement by God to Moses (ch. XI. 1-3), the announcement by Moses to Pharaoh (verses 4-8), the striking paragraph which emphasizes the failure of all that had gone before to effect deliverance, and so heightens the effect of that which is to follow (verses 9-10); the command of Jehovah to Israel to prepare a lamb and to use it in a way appointed (ch. XII. 1-14); the repetition of these commands by Moses to the elders of Israel (verses 21-28); the final stroke and Israel's deliverance (verses 29-36); the start from Rameses to Succoth, still within the borders of Egypt (verses 37-42); and at Succoth the promulgation of three ordinances to be observed thereafter, those of the Passover, of Unleavened Bread, and of the Sanctification of the firstborn (ch. XII. 43-XIII. 16); the whole section closing with the passage of Israel out of Egypt and their coming under the leadership of God (verses 17-22).

Looking at this history we see:—

1. That Israel was redeemed by means of a punishment inflicted by God. This final display of the power of God is described as *one plague more*,² and is spoken of as a *smiting* or chastisement.³ In this way it becomes a true picture of the real redemption, which was obtained for us by the infliction of punishment for sin. It is a well-known fact that sin is said to be remitted in Scripture, but the punishment of sin is never spoken of as remitted. When redemption finally took place the punishment for sin would assuredly fall, and not without punishment could a deliverance be effected.

2. We see further that the punishment which secured redemption was the punishment of death. *All the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die*.⁴ All the plagues were punishments, but only by the stroke of death could salvation come to Israel. So it is the truth of God that not even all the sorrows of the Man acquainted with grief could by themselves

¹ Except the Unleavened Bread section (ch. XII. 15-20), which was probably inserted here by Moses for completeness. It was, we may believe, an addition to the commands relating to the Passover given during the days when Israel waited at Succoth, before finally passing the borders of Egypt. The absence of any reference to it in the instructions given to the elders and people (verses 21-28) confirms the view that it had not been given at that time.

² Ch. XI. 1; cf. XII. 13.

³ Ch. XII. 12-13.

⁴ Ch. XI. 5.

procure our release from sin and Satan. According to the Scriptures Christ *died* for our sins, and in saving others must lose His own life.

3. We observe that the children of Israel were under the condemnation equally with the Egyptians. A distinction is indeed drawn between them and the Egyptians in speaking to Pharaoh,¹ but Moses is commissioned to explain to the Israelites that this is not on account of a privileged immunity. Jehovah's message to them was, *When I see the blood I will pass over you, and there shall be no plague upon you, to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.*² The stroke was no doubt a judgment on the Egyptians, but the Israelites no less than they *hearkened not*³ to Moses speaking in the name of God, and no less than the Egyptians were idolatrous and stiff-necked.⁴ They themselves were liable to the destroying stroke. So indeed if fulfilment must answer to type, the stroke of death by which mankind is redeemed must be a stroke to which mankind stands liable; or, in the New Testament phrase, Christ died *for our sins*.

4. The children of Israel escaped the general judgment through the Blood of the Lamb. This direction at once connected the whole with the primeval law or custom of animal offerings. Moses called it *the sacrifice of Jehovah's passover*; ⁵ and our thoughts are carried back at once to Abel and to Noah and to Abraham, and perhaps most of all to the scene on Moriah, where the Lord prepared a ram and Abraham offered it up *in the stead of his son*. Here too the lamb was to be killed, but the blood was now to be caught in a basin, and sprinkled upon the doorposts and lintels of each house for a token; and where Jehovah saw the blood He would pass over, and the lives within would be preserved. We need not elaborate the significance of this command. It speaks undoubtedly of the Saviour whose Blood was to be shed instead of ours. His blood-shedding was a true atonement to turn away the righteous judgment of God directed against sinful men. It is the preparation for the developed ritual of Leviticus, it leads on to the revelation by Isaiah,⁶ and to John the Baptist, and to the Apostles, and to the Apocalyptic visions.

So then we see here that the redemption of Israel took place by means of death; death in Egyptian houses and in Israelite homes. To understand the full meaning of the Dying of Him concerning whom these things are written, and with a

¹ Ch. xi. 7.

⁴ Ezek. xx. 7, 8.

² Ch. xii. 13.

⁵ Ch. xii. 27.

³ Ch. vi. 9.

⁶ Ch. liii.

view to whom all this was done, we must combine these two pictures.

First then as regards the death of the firstborn throughout Egypt. We see that this broke the power of Egypt. Pharaoh could hold the people no longer, even as *through death* the Lord Jesus *brought to nought him that had the power of death, that is the Devil*. And as the Israelites on that night despoiled the Egyptians, so we read that our Lord on the cross *despoiled the principalities and the powers* leagued against us.¹ The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is God's law, but thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Once more we notice that the stroke fell on the first-born of men, and of men's faithful servants the cattle, not directly on Pharaoh, nor exclusively on the Egyptians. So the stroke which secured man's redemption fell not upon Satan, but upon the glory² and the heir of mankind, *the pre-eminence of dignity and the pre-eminence of power*, the second Adam, the firstborn of all creation,³ our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Turning then to the death of the Lamb in Israelite homes, we get a still clearer view of our salvation. We see that the Saviour whose life-surrender rescues us from dying is Himself without blemish; we see that He lays down His life as a sacrifice to God; that His sacred Body though slain and stretched upon a frame⁴ should be marvellously preserved. We see that He is both the shelter and sustenance of His people. And as regards the saved we mark that it is still by the obedience of faith that they are saved. Their faith accepted the appointed means, though to all outward appearances it was foolishness. Still it was the power of God to every one who believed in it and followed out the directions. There are other illustrations also of the way of salvation, such as the turning of heart from the Egyptian bondage, while the bondage itself was still unrelaxed. With loins girded, shoes on their feet, and staff in their hand, they set themselves to go out of Egypt and journey towards the promised Canaan. This change of mind is what the New Testament calls repentance. The future pilgrim has not yet set foot on the journey, but God turns his heart thither as surely as He gives him faith.

In this way was Israel delivered, and in that night they journeyed from Rameses to Succoth. Here, as there is reason

¹ Col. II. 14, 15.

² Cf. Gen. XLIX. 3.

³ Col. I. 15, 17.

⁴ For it was to be roasted, not sodden or boiled.

to believe, they waited seven days,¹ giving time both for the official permit to cross the borders,² and for the gathering, marshalling, and numbering which there took place.³ For Israel that month of their redemption became *the beginning of months*,⁴ even as for us the day of our redemption in Christ Jesus is the beginning of new life, old things passed away and all things becoming new. Now at last they were free, they were outside the realm of Pharaoh, they were started on the road to their own inheritance. But never to the last step of their pilgrimage, not even when they had entered the promised land, must they for a year or for a day forget the price of their freedom, or cease to shelter themselves under the Blood of the Lamb. If they could not for ever stay in their blood-sprinkled houses, *all the congregation of Israel* must keep the Passover year by year; and day by day the first-born of men and of cattle through all their borders must be surrendered to Jehovah.⁵ If they need not year by year rise up and leave Egypt, every year for seven full days after the Passover Feast they must exclude all leaven from their houses,⁶ as in the days of their hasty departure. And indeed the consecration of the firstborn⁷ was like a consecration of the first-fruits, and so of the whole nation, as being not their own but bought with a price. Is it possible to doubt that these things took place with a view to the teaching of the Gospel that the Lord Jesus died for our sins so that henceforth we should not serve sin; and that this fact not only stands at the beginning of our new lives, but is to be the daily remembrance and constant motive power through our earthly pilgrimage and in the eternal habitations. Meanwhile we too have our memorial Ordinance, instituted like the Passover, in remembrance of *that night of Jehovah*,⁸ the same night in which He was betrayed.

One further point only remains to be noticed in this rapid survey of a history which in a pre-eminent degree is "made like" the salvation wrought out by our Redeemer. We read, in its closing words,⁹ and they are emphasized as the perpetual experience of the redeemed people from that time forwards, that *when Pharaoh had let the people go God led them*. And here also is prefigured a profound truth of re-

¹ Cf. Num. xxxiii. 3, 4.

² See chs. xiii. 18 and xii. 37.

³ Ch. xiii. 1, 2.

⁴ Ch. xiii. 11-16.

⁵ Ch. xiii. 17, 21, 22.

⁶ Ch. xiii. 17.

⁷ Ch. xii. 2.

⁸ Ch. xiii. 3-10.

⁹ Ch. xii. 42.

demption, which St. Paul has emphasized especially in the Epistle to the Romans, where he teaches that being made free from sin we at once become servants to righteousness and to God, and that as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God, and on the road to life and glory.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SALVATION.

WITH the fourteenth chapter of the Book of Exodus a fresh section of the narrative begins, and continues without break until chapter XXIV. 11, where Israel is in the picture carried into the very presence of God, and there left; *they beheld God and did eat and drink*. This section we have described as being made like the path of salvation, the pilgrim's progress from redemption to glory.

THE PASSAGE OF THE RED SEA.

The first thing that God arranged for the people after their exodus from Egypt was an outward and visible sign of their redemption; by which both fear of God and trust in God were quickened and confirmed. While they remained in Egypt it had been made clear to the Israelites that their deliverance was the work of their Saviour and Redeemer alone. Their own part had been merely that of spectators, first of all, and then of humble recipients of salvation. They were to receive a further illustration of this truth in the passage of the Red Sea. Instead of starting at once on their pilgrim journey, they were brought by Divine command into a position which once more revealed to them their own utter helplessness against the power of their relentless oppressor and former master. At the encampment marked out by Jehovah, with the Egyptian army marching in pursuit, and the impassable sea in front, escape once more seemed impossible; and being sore afraid they cried to Jehovah. Once more they were bidden not to fear, but to stand still and see the salvation of Jehovah. Jehovah will fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace. So by their Redeemer's arm the waters were divided, the bed of the sea dried; the passage was made in safety and in light by night, the waters protecting their flanks like a wall,¹ and the cloud covering their rear; while those very

¹ Cf. Nahum, III. 8.

waters which had protected them became the destruction of their foes. So once more in figure they went out, a picture-exodus from Egypt.

St. Paul calls this their Baptism in the cloud and in the sea.¹ It was not their redemption, but the sacrament of their redemption. And it is indeed a picture of what Baptism is to us. Jesus Christ died for us; we accept the purchased freedom; and we are free and safe as Israel was when they had passed the confines of Egypt and come under the leadership of God. But for us, as for Israel, He appoints a sacrament of redemption. Like Israel's descent into the Red Sea our descent into the waters of Baptism is a picture of deliverance through death. With us too the death through which we pass *shook off*² our foes for ever. And the detailed circumstances of Israel's deliverance are all adapted to be a figure of Holy Baptism. We see two powers at work in the passage of the Red Sea; the waters like a wall on the right hand and on the left, and the pillar of cloud coming between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel, and giving light by night to the people of God. St. Paul draws attention to the fact that Israel was baptized in the cloud as well as in the sea; and so we in our baptism enjoy the separating power of the Holy Spirit, as well as the sheltering virtue of the Blood of Christ. *Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto Jehovah, and spake saying, I will sing unto Jehovah, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea. Jehovah is my strength and my song, and He is become my salvation. He hath done it*³ is the song of the redeemed in all ages and for ever, *the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb.*⁴

MARAH. THE STATUTE AND ORDINANCE.

On leaving the Red Sea, Moses led the people onward three days' journey through a waterless desert until they reached Marah. Here springs were found, but the water was undrinkable and the people murmured. *Moses cried unto Jehovah, and Jehovah showed him a tree,*⁵ *and he cast it into the*

¹ 1 Cor. x. 2.

² Ch. xiv. 27, marg.

³ Ps. xxii. 31.

⁴ Rev. xv. 3.

⁵ Why "a tree"? Is there not here also a recollection of that which pervades the immediate previous context, and which we shall see to fill the history which follows, namely, the dying of our Lord Jesus Christ upon a tree? The cross of Jesus, shown to the heart by God, and cast as it were into all bitter waters which we meet on our pilgrimage, will make them sweet and wholesome, Cf. Rom. v. 3-11.

waters, and the waters were made sweet. There He made for them a statute and an ordinance, and there He proved them. The statute and the ordinance which God made with Israel at the beginning of their redeemed life was none other than the lesson learned from this their first experience in that life. It is His constant purpose and rule for His people throughout their earthly pilgrimage to prove and try them by adverse circumstances, such as Israel met with on the three days' weary march, and the disappointment at Marah. Such trials will reveal the frailty of God's people. But they are also opportunities for crying to Jehovah, and the cry will always meet with immediate response. At the same time the path of obedience is ever the path of safety. The Israelites were told that if they gave heed to God's commands He would undertake to preserve them from sickness, *for I am Jehovah that healeth thee.*¹ He has power not only to make unwholesome waters sweet, but to overcome all unhygienic conditions, and to preserve His people in health throughout their journey. Even so by an eternal statute the path of obedience is to us the path of spiritual health and spiritual immunity.

ELIM. REFRESHMENT.

From Marah they came to Elim with its springs and palm grove, and here they encamped by the waters; a beautiful and necessary picture of the truth that although the way of salvation may be punctuated by trial, each trial has "afterward" its compensating refreshment.

THE WILDERNESS OF SIN. MANNA.

All the congregation of Israel reached the wilderness of Sin just one month after their departure from Egypt. Here occurred the miracle of the Manna, the history of which occupies one whole chapter. By this time all stores of food brought out from Egypt had probably been exhausted, and the occasion had arisen to show that Jehovah was their Store. He Himself would supply their needs, not only by one act of abundant giving, but by daily watchful care, giving day by day their daily bread: and Himself securing them against any loss from keeping His Sabbaths, as if He had said, "I am Jehovah that feedeth thee". Now it is plain that God might

¹ In the wilderness this promise was fulfilled (Deut. viii. 4). On three occasions only was there an epidemic, and on each occasion as the result of rebellion (Num. xi. 33; xvi. 49; xxv. 9).

have fed Israel in many ways, as for example by the quails which were also brought on the present occasion, and again at a later date, but which are here referred to quite briefly. Their mention here at all may serve to emphasize this fact that God was not tied to one means of feeding His people; but the cursory way in which they are spoken of as compared with the elaborate account given of the Manna, shows us that more is intended by this history than the mere general truth that Jehovah is the food of His people. The only adequate reason that can be given for the great miracle of the Manna is that it was intended to be made like the Son of God who came down from heaven to give life to the world. And in this connection we notice the following particulars recorded of the Manna. It was *from heaven*, but it was seen *upon the face of the wilderness*.¹ It was a new thing; like, but different from, that article of commerce which the Israelites had known in Egypt as *Manna*.² Many circumstances combined to show that it was a miraculous production; for example, its appearing daily except on the Sabbath; its nature, as sometimes corruptible and sometimes not; and its persistence through the forty years' wandering in the wilderness, and ceasing on the entry into Canaan. Once more, it sustained life, and so is called *bread*; ³ it needed to be gathered and eaten; and some of it was kept before Jehovah in perennial freshness, and afterwards laid up in the holiest place before the Testimony. All these particulars, which are emphasized in the record, find their fulfilment in Christ. He is *the true bread out of heaven*,⁴ seen upon the face of this wilderness world. His Humanity was a new thing, miraculously produced. He gives life to the world, offering Himself to be taken and eaten. He, in His glorified Humanity, in the power of an indissoluble life, is in the presence of God for us, our *hidden Manna*; ⁵ and when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall we also appear with Him in glory.

REPHIDIM. THE SMITTEN ROCK.

From the wilderness of Sin, passing by the intermediate stages, the record brings us at once to the encampment at Rephidim. Here the people are suffered to thirst, as in the wilderness of Sin they were suffered to hunger, that they might know Jehovah to be the Fountain of Living Waters, as

¹ Verses 4, 14.

⁴ John vi. 32.

² Verse 15.

⁵ Rev. ii. 17,

³ Verses 4, 15.

well as the Bread of Life. In the same way our Lord Jesus suffered Martha and Mary to feel the pang of bereavement, that they might know Him to be the Resurrection and the Life. But here again the method and not the mere fact of supply claims our attention. The directions given to Moses are few but significant. He is to take the elders of Israel, for whose instruction the whole proceeding is designed, and to pass on before the people, taking the rod with which he smote the Nile in his hand. *Behold, I will stand before thee upon the rock in Horeb*, said Jehovah, *and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel.* This answered the unbelieving question of the people, *Is Jehovah among us or not?* God led the way to a rock; His presence, manifested probably by the pillar of cloud, rested upon it; and there He showed Himself to be their Rock of reliance, and the Fount and Source of their supply. From this time forward Jehovah was known to Israel as "the Rock";¹ and Jewish tradition symbolized the truth of His continual presence by the legend that the Rock, or the stream from the Rock, followed Israel through all their wanderings. St. Paul teaches us that in a spiritual sense the legend is true; for the Source of supply of Israel in the wilderness was the ever-present Christ, *the Rock was Christ.*² That is to say, the Rock in Horeb, no less than the Manna in the wilderness of Sin, was a Sacrament of the presence of Christ, an outward and visible sign of that inward and spiritual grace, the abiding presence of Jehovah. And as we saw in the circumstances of the Manna a particular representation of the Christ, so we see in all the circumstances of this miracle particular significance. In the former picture the emphasis is laid upon the incarnation of the Bread of Life. In the present picture the emphasis falls rather upon the penal suffering through which the life-giving stream is poured forth. The union of two Natures in one Person is first foreshadowed by the appearance of the Divine Presence crowning a cliff of Horeb. The stroke of the Divine judgment is next seen to fall upon the Rock thus sanctified; and so, only so, it yields its store of living waters. It is not without purpose that the rod is here designated *the rod wherewith thou smotest the river*, and not, as elsewhere in the near context, where, as we shall see, the symbolism is different, *the rod of God.*³ It is here significant of the Divine judgment which must fall upon the

¹ Deut. xxxii. 4, 15, 18, 30, 31.

² Contrast verse 5 with verse 9.

³ 1 Cor. x. 4.

incarnate Saviour, but which could only fall upon Him once ; so that on the next occasion when water was to be fetched from the ever-present Rock, the command ran otherwise, *Take ye the rod*—not now “the rod wherewith thou smotest,” but simply “the rod”—*and speak unto the rock, that it give forth its water.*¹ The disobedience of Moses on this second occasion, in smiting the rock instead of speaking to it, so far distorted the prophetic picture ; but his rash act has been over-ruled by God, directing our attention as it does all the more to the perfect manner in which the type was adapted to the coming reality. Every detail of the picture here answers to the facts of Gospel history. God assumed Human Nature, that in it He might receive the stroke of Divine justice, through which He became the source of life eternal to His people ; not only His Flesh being meat indeed, but His Blood also drink indeed, for all the sons of men.

CONFLICT WITH AMALEK.

Then came Amalek and fought with Israel in Rephidim. No picture of the pilgrim's life would be complete without a scene of conflict. Since the Lord shook off the Egyptians in the Red Sea, Israel had travelled far, and hitherto had met with no external opposition ; but now *came Amalek and fought against them.* It is not a fresh onslaught by the old enemy and oppressor, nor even the hindrance of their own imperfections, but it is the inhabitants of the land through which they journey who now assemble to bar their progress to the promised land. And so it is that the Christian on pilgrimage must meet in conflict and either overcome or be overcome by the hostile world through which he passes. What follows in the record gives a vivid picture of this conflict in its progress and in its final issue. We see first God's people, when confronted with this opposition, engaged in a council of war. *Moses said unto Joshua, Choose us out men, and go out, fight with Amalek.* This is no question of redemption, but an incident of the pilgrimage ; and so the people are not called upon as before to stand still and see the salvation of Jehovah, but summoned to go out to the fight. Meanwhile Moses takes his part in the general action. *To-morrow, says he, I will stand on the top of the hill with the rod of God in my hand.* His part was the part of prayer, grasping by faith the covenanted power of God. *So Joshua did as Moses had said to him, and fought with Amalek.*

¹ Num. xx. 8.

And Moses, Aaron, and Hur went up to the top of the hill. And it came to pass, when Moses held up his hand, that Israel prevailed; and when he let down his hand, Amalek prevailed. But Moses' hands were heavy.

Is not this history designed to illustrate the Christian's conflict with the world, in whatever form that opposition may be realized? With us as with Israel there are experiences of victory or of defeat, whose explanation is to be found in the maintenance or otherwise of prayer and faith. But after all this is the mere background of this picture. The foreground is filled not with Israel, who are not again mentioned; not with Moses standing on the hill-top, and trying to keep his hands up; not even with Joshua and his chosen men in their fight. It is filled rather with a group of three men on the hill-top, with the final issue of the conflict when the sun went down, and with the written promise and decree. Let us fix our attention on these three in succession. We remember that Moses was left on the hill-top, standing there with the rod of God in his hand, uplifted in behalf of Israel, but with fainting strength and dropping hands. So Aaron and Hur, who had climbed the mount with him, but who have not so far taken any part in the picture, now *took a stone, and put it under him, and he sat thereon; and Aaron and Hur stayed up his hands, the one on the one side, and the other on the other side; and his hands were steady until the going down of the sun.* The action is in a true sense natural, but the circumstance and the record alike bear unmistakable reference to the Son of God. The central figure of the group is Moses, seated on the stone, with the rod of God in his hand; made, in the representation, like our Lord Jesus Christ in His Humanity tranquilly seated, and in His Deity always possessed of power Divine. He is the true Prophet, like unto Moses, raised up from among His brethren, sent to deliver them from spiritual bondage; Man, but with the rod of God in His hand, the necessary endowment for His work of salvation, very God and very Man, now seated at the right hand of God for us, ever living to make intercession for us. But the steadiness of Moses' hands of prevailing prayer was due to the support of Aaron and of Hur. These two men were probably both nearly related to Moses. Aaron was his brother, and according to a Jewish tradition Hur was husband of Miriam, and so brother-in-law to Moses. But even if Jewish tradition on this point is not to be trusted, the union of these three in the picture is sufficiently clear, and a further detail is thereby

added to the portraiture of the Christ. In a few days' time Aaron was to be designated as the Priest-Mediator; while Hur was of the tribe of Judah,¹ which had already been marked in prophecy as the royal tribe from whom Shiloh the Prince should come.² So that the three in unison represent our Lord in his three-fold office of Prophet, Priest, and King, by virtue of which He remains our Advocate upon the eternal hill. But it is very worthy of notice that though the hands of Moses were now steady, it is not said that Israel at once prevailed. Indeed it is implied that the conflict continued all through the day until the going down of the sun. But we do hear, and this is the next point emphasized in the record, what the final issue of the conflict was. *And Joshua prostrated Amalek and his people with the edge of the sword*; that is at sundown it was found that Joshua, it does not say Israel, had prostrated the foe. Let us fix our attention upon this picture. Our own conflict, with its ups and downs, is for the moment out of sight. We see only the picture of the Lord Jesus Christ, made higher than the heavens, watching, caring, interceding, near to God, and near also to us; and we see also the final issue of our perpetual warfare. When the sun goes down upon the conflict's close, we shall find that our Joshua has prostrated the enemy. *Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.* Here ends the history of that memorable day; but the Lord, who arranged it, arranged also that it should be kept in remembrance. *Jehovah said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in the book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: that I will utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven.* The writing in the book was for after-generations, that we through patience and comfort of the writings might have hope: the rehearsing in the ears of Joshua was for him who had that day won a decisive victory, and gave him the assurance that Jehovah would not merely prostrate the foe before him, but finally blot out the very remembrance of them from under heaven. We cannot fail to recognize here a picture of the Divine decree *rehearsed in the ears* of the Captain of our Salvation, when at His resurrection³ and ascension⁴ He triumphed gloriously. And again when the age-long conflict of His Church with the antagonistic world draws at last to its close, He will prostrate the hostile power beneath His feet. This world will then present a different face, when all powers of evil lie prostrate before Him. But

¹ Exod. xxxi. i.² Gen. xlix, 8-10.³ Ps. II. 7-9.⁴ *Ib.* cx.

beyond this millennial peace there is the promise of new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwells righteousness, and the first things are utterly passed away, and shall not be remembered nor come into mind.

But while Amalek remained, cowed and beaten and powerless though they were, the conflict must be maintained, only in the name and by the power of the Lord. So the narrative concludes, *Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi; and he said, Jehovah hath sworn: Jehovah will have war with Amalek from generation to generation.*

We have elaborated this picture-prophecy somewhat at length, both because of its intrinsic importance, and because of the clear indications which its omissions no less than its contents afford, that it is intended to be made like the Son of God in His working.

THE VISIT OF JETHRO.

The visit of Jethro occupies a not inconsiderable portion of the narrative. We read first that he was attracted by the news of *all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel His people, how that Jehovah had brought Israel out of Egypt.* On reaching the Israelite camp *Moses told his father-in-law all that Jehovah had done unto Pharaoh and to the Egyptians for Israel's sake, all the travail that had come upon them by the way, and how Jehovah delivered them.* The effect of this upon the mind of Jethro was that he *rejoiced for all the goodness which Jehovah had done to Israel*, recognized Jehovah as *greater than all gods*, and offered to Him the homage of his tribe, inviting Aaron and all the elders of Israel to be present at the sacrificial feast. We may see here, as in the history of Joseph, a prophetic picture of the fact that Gentile peoples would be the first to see the full significance of the Divine Act of Redemption. And it will certainly teach us a profound truth of the pilgrim-life, namely, that we are redeemed and saved not only for our own comfort and blessing, but to be a witness to the Saviour's power, and a means of drawing others to allegiance to Him. Before Jethro took his departure from the Israelite camp, he was able to offer a useful contribution to the well-being of the community, in his proposals for the devolution of heavy burdens borne hitherto by Moses alone. The narrative of this may suggest to us that each individual has his own contribution to make towards the Church of Christ. He brings not only his own personal confession and public homage

to the Saviour, but also his individual gifts and powers, whatever they may be. Only they must be given, as Jethro gave his, in submission to the revealed commands of God,¹ and in reliance for their success upon the presence and blessing of God;² but offered in this spirit of piety and humility they will be accepted, used, and owned.

¹ Verse 23.

² Verse 19.

CHAPTER V.

THE COVENANT.

IN the preceding chapters we have taken a rapid survey of the history of the Israelite people recorded in the Book of Exodus, and have seen reason to believe that the events were so arranged and have been so recorded as to be a true likeness of the greater Redemption and fuller Salvation towards which the sacred history is ever tending. We come now to the history of Israel before Mount Sinai, where they encamped after their departure from Rephidim. Here they remained for a whole year, and the rest of the Book of Exodus, together with the whole of Leviticus, are concerned with the events of that memorable encampment. We are now about to be led directly to that which is the special subject of our study, the Law of Offerings given through Moses during the sojourn before Sinai. But before this Law was given, several events took place, which it is necessary first to pass in review, if we are to appreciate the occasion and realize the setting of that great prophetic picture.

We have seen that from the Red Sea up to Rephidim there has been a series of events (which we may reckon as seven in number) illustrating the pilgrim-life of the Redeemed. Arrived at Sinai, Israel are instructed more particularly in the responsibilities and privilege of their position, and their covenant relation with Jehovah is expressly announced and formally established. This establishment of the covenant with Israel will be the subject of the present chapter. It will be seen that the purport, and responsibilities, and final issue of this covenant are all so framed and so realized as to be a true picture of the covenant which God makes with men in Christ. It may indeed be said, as Jeremiah has said, and the writer to the Hebrews has repeated,¹ that the new covenant was *not according to* the old. But this is so inasmuch as the blessings of the old covenant were largely external, while those of the new

¹ Jer. xxxi. 31, 32; Heb. viii. 8, 9.

are mainly spiritual. It does not for a moment imply that the covenant made with Israel at Sinai was not like the eternal covenant made with men by God through Christ, as copy answers to pattern and shadow to substance. We shall see on the contrary that the covenant-making at Sinai, like all which has preceded, points directly to that other covenant; and that by that covenant the terms of its privileges, the measure of its responsibilities, the formal rite by which it was ratified, and the blessedness to which it admitted, were alike determined.

It was in the third month after the children of Israel had gone out of Egypt that they found themselves¹ near the place where Jehovah had appeared to Moses, and given him the commission to rescue His people from their bondage. Here they encamped in the Wilderness before the Mount,² probably on the first and second days of that month. On the third day of the month, according to Jewish tradition, which here has great probability, Moses went up into the mountain, and there received an oracle of God giving him a special message to the people and announcing the purpose of their redemption from Egypt. Moses thereupon descended the mountain, and calling for the elders of Israel communicated to them the Divine purpose. The people signified their acquiescence, and Moses reported their words to Jehovah. He was then given directions for the preparation of the people against the third day, when *Jehovah would come down in the sight of all the people upon Mount Sinai*. Moses returned to the camp with these orders, and the rest of that day and the morrow were spent in making the necessary preparations. On the third day, the fifth of the month, when it was morning there were thunders and lightnings, a thick cloud lowered on the mountain, and the voice of a trumpet pealed from the darkness, so that throughout the camp the people trembled. Moses, as he had been commanded, brought forth the people in response to the trumpet-call, and assembled them near the foot of the mountain *to meet God*. Thereupon Jehovah descended upon the mountain in fire, the whole mass smoked like a furnace, and shook with earthquake,

¹ Exod. III. 12.

² The exact spot has been identified with practical certainty, and has been described by the late Dean Stanley and other travellers. It was in the long and wide valley of Er Rahah, at the head of which stands the giant mass of Ras Sufsafah, that Israel pitched their tents. From every quarter of their encampment The Mount was visible. But nothing can add to the impressiveness of the account in Holy Scripture (to which this locality answers in every particular), and accordingly in this chapter we shall confine ourselves to what is there recorded.

while the trumpet-voice *waxed louder and louder*. Moses spoke, doubtless announcing the presence of the people as commanded, and God answered him in the hearing of the people with articulate voice, calling him to ascend the mountain alone. Arrived in the presence of God, he received an order to go down to the people and warn them to beware of irreverence, or of the slightest transgression of the bounds set round the Mount, on pain of instant death, and a direction that when he next ascended the mountain Aaron should accompany him. With this warning message and direction Moses returned to the people, and the whole company stood in awful expectancy while the mountain smoked and trembled, and thunder rolled and lightnings flashed, and the trumpet-peals continued. Then was heard by all the people the articulate voice of words, the voice of God in ten distinct and ordered utterances, testifying against their sins with every circumstance of fiery indignation and irresistible power. We do not wonder that the people gave way and retired far off from the awful mountain, entreating Moses to act as intermediary, *speaking thou with us and we will hear, but let not God speak with us lest we die*. Moses comforts them with the assurance that God is come to prove them, or show them to themselves, and to implant His fear in their hearts, and not to destroy them. However, they dared not approach the mountain again, but Moses and Aaron¹ *drew near to the thick darkness where God was*. Arrived *where God was*, Moses received certain directions as to the worship of Jehovah, and a series of ordinances to be observed by the Israelites; together with a command that he and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel should afterwards come up to the mount, and all worship afar off, while Moses alone should draw near, and the people generally should not accompany him to the mount. Moses then returned to the people and told them *all the words of Jehovah and all the ordinances; and all the people answered with one voice and said, All the words which Jehovah hath spoken we will do*. Moses then wrote all the words of Jehovah in a book, and so closed that great and dreadful day.²

On the next day, the sixth of the month, there takes place first a solemn ratification of the covenant *under the mount*, and then the chosen representatives pass the bounds, and,

¹ That Aaron accompanied Moses is certain from the command in ch. xix. 24, though Moses alone is mentioned in the text. Aaron's presence is, however, implied in the wording of ch. xxiv. 1, 2, at the close of this stay in the mountain.

² This day, the 5th of the 3rd month, was afterwards fixed upon as the date for the Feast of Harvest or Pentecost.

unharméd, *see the God of Israel*, and eat and drink in His presence.

Such, in briefest outline, is the story. We now turn to consider its spiritual significance.

The first truth which was impressed upon the Israelites was that God had redeemed them from the Egyptian bondage that they might be a people near to Himself. *Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto Myself.* In the same way the end of the redemption in Christ Jesus is that we may be brought near to God.

But if the goal of Israel's redemption was to be near to God, it was made very clear that in themselves they were excluded from His presence. Again and again the injunction not to draw near is repeated,¹ bounds being set around the mountain, and the people rigorously excluded, *lest Jehovah break forth upon them.* This carries our thoughts back to the earliest symbolic prophecy, where human forms were seen indeed hard by the tree of life, as a pledge of God's final purpose of mercy towards mankind, but meanwhile the flame of a sword turned every way to guard the path of access, and maintain man's exclusion.

But though Israel was thus excluded from approach to God, Jehovah Himself provided a person through whom they were finally enabled to draw near. Moses at the Divine command brings the people to meet God. They stand afar off, but he draws near to the thick darkness where God was. Though Aaron on one occasion accompanies him, Moses alone acts as mediator throughout,² and it is evident that when the representatives of Israel are at length admitted to the presence of Jehovah, it is under the leadership and by the introduction of Moses. In this way there is foreshadowed the office and work of the one Mediator between God and Man, Himself Man, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Let us now turn to examine this record rather more in detail, and we shall find that not only in its main outlines, but also in its minuter circumstances, it speaks of Christ.

It will be remembered that the words in which Jehovah announced His purpose towards the Israelites are adopted by St. Paul³ and by St. Peter⁴ as expressing His purpose towards those who are saved by Christ Jesus. The ground of the

¹ Ch. XIX. 12, 21-24; XXIV. 2.

² Ch. XX. 21, 22; XXI. 1, "thou"; XXIV. 1, 2, and so in all that follows.

³ Eph. I. 14; Titus II. 14.

⁴ 1 Pet. II. 5, 9.

salvation is in each case seen to lie in God Himself. The Israelites are addressed as *the house of Jacob, the children of Israel*, reminding them that their position rests upon His sovereign choice. No less does it rest upon His work of power, *Ye have seen what I did, and how I bare you*; and its permanence and safety is assured by their connection with God Himself, *I brought you unto Myself*. Even so in every particular is our salvation in Christ Jesus; it springs from an eternal choice; it has been wrought out by a Divine Saviour; it becomes individually operative through the Divine Spirit; and it brings us under the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, *I brought you unto Myself*. Again, the responsibility incurred by the Israelites was that they should obey God's voice and keep His covenant. And so, according to the testimony of the whole New Testament, by the Gospel of free salvation in Christ Jesus we do not make void but rather establish the law.

The privileges to which the acceptance of the responsibility admitted the Israelites are described in terms which can be directly transferred to the Christian believer, as we have seen in the words of the Apostles quoted above. And to them St. John adds his testimony in the form of adoring praise to the Saviour,¹ *Unto Him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by His blood; and He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father; to Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.* We feel that this language is no mere adaptation of Old Testament phraseology, but rather that the terms of the covenant at Sinai were designed to express the principles of the eternal covenant.

Once more we see that the acceptance by the Israelites of this general position² involved them in the observance of Divine precepts of life and action. In the first place it involved them in a definite break with sin. *His fear is before you that ye sin not.*³ This primary obligation stands for all time, and was perhaps on this account promulgated not through Moses but by God Himself directly from the burning mountain top, out of the thick darkness and devouring fire. It is impossible that any development of human knowledge can alter this law, which from heaven defines certain things as *not* to be done. These things are ever to be recognized as contrary to the will of God, and therefore finally debarred to men. *I am God, therefore thou shalt not do these things.* But while we do well

¹ Rev. I. 5-6,² Ch. XIX. 8,³ Ch. XX. 20,

to lay stress upon the tone of Divine Authority which underlies the Ten Commandments, we cannot miss the appeal to the human will which thrills in the opening words, *I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage*. Most truly is this in harmony with the Divine character, and with the later revelation of that character in the Gospel of Christ, where the whole force of the appeal to the human will springs from the now fully manifested redemption. But for Israel in their position at that time there was not only a general prohibition against sin; there were further particular directions which affected their religious and social life, and restricted also their individual liberty. To these also they must submit when they come under the covenant. These directions were given to Moses on the mount of God, Aaron also being present though not the recipient of the Divine commands. It would be beside our purpose to deal with these in detail, but a careful study of the passage¹ which we believe to be what is called *the Book of the Covenant*,² will reveal a progress of thought which we will briefly indicate. Moses himself divides this Divine communication into two parts, *the words of Jehovah* and *the ordinances*.³ The words of Jehovah we take to be the first section of the passage in which Jehovah speaks of Himself;⁴ the ordinances commence with the first verse of chapter XXI. It is significant that the first words of the Book of the Covenant are concerned with *the words of Jehovah*, on the subject of His relationship to His people, and of His people to Himself. He reminds them how they have seen that He has talked with them from Heaven. He speaks to them about their sacrificial worship of Him. He promises that in every place where He records, or causes His Name to be remembered, He will come to them and bless them.⁵ This is again in strict accordance with the teaching of the New Testament, and we cannot but conclude that it is in view of an unchangeable principle, namely, that the root of all true morality lies in an apprehension of the fact of Divine revelation, and in a reverent approach to God by the revealed way.

As regards the ordinances to be set before the Israelites for their observance, the whole passage seems to consist of six sections which we will rapidly pass in review.

1. Ch. XX.-XXII. 17. In this section we find that the

¹ From ch. xx. 22-ch. xxiii.

² Ch. xxiv. 7.

³ Ch. xxiv. 3.

⁴ Ch. xx. 22 to end.

⁵ There lies here the promise of future Theophanies, whether in the central Tent of Meeting, which was afterwards to be constructed, or elsewhere,

Israelites were to be true and just in all their dealings. The standard of truth and justice set before them is that which was generally recognized at that time. It bears strong resemblance to the customary laws of those tribes with which Israel had had most connection during their sojourn on the borders of Egypt. It may be taken as giving Divine sanction to that standard of equity which was the reflection of the common conscience of the time. The ideal was no doubt imperfect, but so far as it went it was to be respected. What the common conscience repudiated the Israelite must not condone. We are reminded that under the Gospel the law of conscience is always regarded as sacred, even when that conscience is imperfectly enlightened. And St. Paul teaches us that according to the will of God the Christian is obliged to respect also the conscientious scruples of others. The man of God must respond to the very highest standard of equity which prevails in his neighbourhood and in his time.

2. Ch. XXII. 18-20. This short paragraph refers to three customs which were prevalent amongst the tribes with which Israel was acquainted, but which must nevertheless be totally prohibited amongst themselves, those who dared to practise any one of them being at once put to death. This stern enactment may show us, as it must have shown Israel, that while current notions of justice and equity were to be respected, the mere prevalence of a custom could in no sense sanction its adoption when it offended against certain well-known canons of Divine truth. Sorcery could no longer be tolerated in the presence of a Divine revelation. Bestiality was unthinkable when God had spoken to man and brought him near to Himself. Polytheism was impossible where Jehovah was known. This is also a principle for the man of God in every age, and not least of all in our own. The revival of unauthorized commerce with the spirit-world, the discussion of eugenics without reference to man's spiritual relationship and unique responsibilities; and the so-called comparison of religions, which ranges the worship of Jehovah alongside that of every other god, all these things can find no place whatever in the life of the man who is in covenant with God through Christ. It matters nothing to him how prevalent they may be in the world around him; for himself they are utterly and finally inadmissible.

3. Ch. XXII. 21-27. In this section we see that God's ordinance for Israel was not merely the observance of recognized principles of justice and equity. In what has preceded

these have been insisted on as regulating intercourse between man and man. But now there is brought to bear in addition the fact of redemption as a motive power and exemplar of action. *A sojourner shalt thou not wrong, neither shalt thou oppress him : for ye were sojourners in the land of Egypt. . . . If thou afflict . . . at all, and they cry at all unto Me, I will surely hear their cry, . . . for I am gracious.* And so it is that the redeemed of the Lord in all ages, knowing at what cost they were redeemed and from how great affliction, have the witness of conscience reinforced and enlightened by personal experience of the presence and the character of their Redeemer.

4. Ch. XXII. 28-XXIII. 9. Here we find the thought of the preceding section still further emphasized, and applied to all the circumstances of the Israelite's daily life. In his civil relations, in the matters of his fields or flocks, in the privacy of his family life, in the choice of his daily food, God was to be in all his thoughts. *Ye shall be holy men unto Me*, constantly recognizing the Hand of God in all these affairs : in all things adopting His standard and His point of view rather than that of *the multitude* ; and taking especial care to preserve undimmed their spiritual sight, and unforgotten the memory of their sojourn in Egypt. This is exactly the spirit in which the Apostles press home upon Christians the recollection of God and of His salvation as affecting every detail of personal life and human relationship. It is only the clearer revelation of God through Jesus Christ, and the surpassing character of the redemption which He effected, affording an even more powerful moral lever than the Old Testament theophanies and deliverances, which makes any difference between the two. The conclusion is once more suggested that the coincidence is the result of design.

5. Ch. XXIII. 10-19. If the Israelite was to have God in all his thoughts, it was necessary that he should be constantly reminded of Him, and for this purpose there were provided means of grace. The present section provides for the hallowing of each seventh year, an institution here first announced, and afterwards explained and extended,¹ and also for the observance of the ancient law of the Sabbath day. Both these were to remind the Israelite of the presence and power of the Creator, the one and only God. Besides these it was now for the first time ordained that three times in the year every male should appear before the Lord Jehovah. The

¹ Lev. xxv.

three feasts were all connected with the progress of agriculture, occurring respectively in the month Abib (when the ear first appeared),¹ at the beginning, and at the end of harvest. The date of the first had already been fixed in connection with the Exodus from Egypt, the precise dates of the other two were to be made known later.² It was then made clear that the number seven was intended to rule the whole system of feasts; first the weekly Sabbath; next the seven days of unleavened bread following the Passover; then the seven weeks to be fulfilled, reckoning from the offering of the first-ripe barley sheaf on the second day of unleavened bread, leading to the feast of weeks or Pentecost, also called the feast of first-fruits; and finally in the seventh month the Feast of Tabernacles which was the feast of ingathering at the end of the year. This began on the fifteenth day of the seventh month and lasted seven days. Thus the Israelite was continually reminded that Jehovah his God was the sole and only Lord, Creator in seven days of heaven and earth; but at the same time each feast was connected also with the redemption from Egypt. The Passover and feast of unleavened bread had already been fixed in connection with their Exodus from Egypt. The date fixed for the feast of first-fruits coincided with the great day when at Sinai Israel was brought into covenant with God, to be from among all the nations *holiness unto Jehovah, the first-fruits of His increase*, and in Jewish tradition the two were ever connected. The Feast of Tabernacles, finally, commemorated the dwelling in booths on their pilgrimage to Canaan; and so their God is not only *the Lord* of Heaven and Earth, He is also *Jehovah*, the God of Covenant and Fulfilled Promise. But to us with the greater redemption before us we see a deeper significance in these feasts. The Passover slain on the fourteenth of the month, and the sheaf of the first-fruits waved in the Tabernacle on the sixteenth of the month, speak to us of Christ our Passover sacrificed on that very day, and on the third day raised from the dead, the first sheaf of the resurrection harvest. Fifty days from that date—at *the Feast of Harvest, the first-fruits of our labours*—the Holy Ghost came down from heaven, and the first-fruits of the harvest of the world was sanctified to Jehovah. But we still wait for the fulfilment of *the feast of ingathering at the end of the year, when we gather in our labours out of the field*. How far-reaching then in its scope is

¹ Abib = month of blooming or of green ears.

² Lev. xxiii.

³ Jer. ii. 3.

the design of these feasts to the Lord Jehovah, which He then sketched out for His people, filling in the details at a later date.¹ But for Israel they were the appointed means of grace, ordinances which bore a direct reference to the facts of their redemption-history, and were designed to keep that history ever before them. Even so for us, not only is the witness of conscience against sin reinforced by a fuller revelation in history of God and of His grace, but the remembrance of that revelation is maintained by the Christian ordinances of the Lord's Day and of the Holy Gospel, and, not without Divine Providence surely, by the sacred seasons of the Church's Year.

6. Ch. XXIII. 20-end. But the Lord's provision for Israel went further even than means of grace. *Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared.* It is important carefully to enquire who is meant by this angel. That He is not a created angel, one, even the most distinguished, of the angelic host, seems clear from the words that follow, *Take ye heed before Him, and hearken to His voice ; provoke Him not ; for He will not pardon your transgression : for My Name is in Him.* Neither is He that Person who is called *the Angel of Jehovah.* The Angel of Jehovah it was who appeared to Moses in the flaming bush on this very spot,² and foretold that Israel when delivered from Egypt should serve God upon the mountain. He it was who claimed the Name Jehovah, and sent Moses to deliver Israel, and did His wonders in Egypt, and bare Israel on eagles' wings, and brought them to Himself, and in whose presence Moses now stood, and who says, *Behold, I send an angel.* We are thus irresistibly led to the conclusion, if words have any meaning, that there is a second angel in whom is God's Name, and who shares the Divine prerogative of pardoning transgression, besides Him whose constant and well-known appellation is the Angel of God, or the Angel of Jehovah. We might well leave this riddle, as perhaps Moses left it, unsolved, if it were not for the open revelation of the New Testament. Moses, we may be sure, knew enough of God to be able to accept His assurance and warning without further question, if necessary. But it is by no means impossible that Moses knew what we cannot doubt, that the Angel whom God here promised was none other

¹ There is no doubt that verses 18, 19, refer also to these feasts. See the commentaries.

² Exod. III. 2, 12, 15.

than the Divine Spirit of whom the first words of his Bible spoke,¹ and of whose abiding presence he was afterwards in so many words assured by God Himself.² And indeed the prophet Isaiah speaks in open terms,³ *Where is He that brought up Israel out of the sea with the shepherds of His flock? where is He that put His Holy Spirit in the midst of them? that caused His glorious arm to go at the right hand of Moses? that divided the waters before them, to make Himself an everlasting Name? that led them through the depths, as a horse in the wilderness, so that they stumbled not? As the cattle that go down into the valley, the Spirit of Jehovah caused them to rest; so didst Thou lead Thy people, to make Thyself a glorious Name.*

A careful perusal of this section in the light of the prophetic commentary, and the New Testament revelation, will convince us that here we have indeed the promise of the guidance of the Holy Spirit to keep Israel in the way, and bring them into the place which God had prepared for them.

Looking back then over these six sections which we have briefly passed in review, we see that the people of God are to reverence the dictates of the common conscience of mankind, but that they are absolutely to deny all that is contrary to the revealed will of God, however specious and prevalent the custom or opinion may be; they are to hide in their hearts what has been revealed to them of the nature and attributes of God; they are to recollect and honour God in every action of their daily lives; they are to be regular in the use of Divine ordinances of religion; they are above all to submit themselves absolutely to the rule and direction of the Holy Spirit of God. This is in fact the rule for all who enter into covenant with God in Christ, expressed with a comprehensiveness and directness which leaves no doubt that the covenant responsibilities of Israel were framed with a view to the covenant responsibilities of the Christian.

The narrative now shows us how a covenant entailing such responsibilities could be entered upon by Israel. It was not enough to respond to *all the words of Jehovah and all the ordinances that all the words which Jehovah hath spoken we will do.* The method by which God and men could be brought together in such a covenant must be carefully considered. We take it that the action of Moses was under Divine direction, though this is not expressly stated. At least it was under

¹ Gen. i. 2.² Num. xi. 17.³ Is. lxiii. 11-14.

prophetic inspiration, a power which evidently rested upon Moses in all the transactions of this and the following days.

Here then we notice first of all that Moses built an altar under the mount. We take the altar raised *under the mount* to be a symbol of the presence of God, condescending to draw near to Israel. The twelve pillars, *according to the twelve tribes of Israel*, in the same way symbolized the presence of the tribes of Israel, entering into the covenant with God. Moses then sent young men of the children of Israel to offer burnt-offerings and peace-offerings to Jehovah. Who these young men were we need not here enquire. The salient fact is that Israel was reminded, in strict accordance with the whole previous course of revelation, that this intercourse with God was contingent on offered sacrifice. The two kinds of sacrifice mentioned here are the only two forms of animal sacrifice known to Israel at the time. It is significant that animal sacrifice alone is mentioned, the reason of which is not far to seek. In entering into covenant with God it is absolutely necessary for Israel that blood shall flow. After the sacrificing we hear only of the blood, Moses taking half of the blood and putting it in basins ready for future use, while the other half is at once sprinkled on the altar, that is to say, it is presented to God. This is the first and ruling idea of blood-shedding in approach to God, namely, that it is shed to reconcile God to us. If we accept simply the teaching of Scripture, which is consistent with itself from Genesis to Revelation, it is not too much to assert that this is the supreme effect of the sacrifice on Calvary. Here we see that before Moses turns with the blood to the people, he presents it Godwards; not merely because God should come first in all things, but chiefly because the blood atones for guilt before the Holy One, and makes way for His mercy to flow towards penitent sinners. Now that, in symbol, the Divine justice is appeased, Moses turns to the people and reads in their hearing the requisitions of the Book of the Covenant. The people in the obedience of faith accept its terms, and for them the blood is then available. *Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which Jehovah hath made with you concerning all these words.* Under the Blood of the Lamb Israel came out of Egypt, and under this Blood they enter into, and as we shall see later abide in, the Covenant.

This wonderful prophecy, the gate by which we enter into the developed treasures of the sacrificial law, is introduced by

the writer to the Hebrews in the course of his great argument,¹ and is there connected with the whole Mosaic system of offerings. We will not then occupy more space in its consideration at present.

The Covenant is now complete, God is reconciled to Israel, and Israel under the great reconciliation becomes the people of God. There needs only a picture of the resultant blessedness of a people thus *saved by Jehovah*.² This picture is not wanting. *Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel.* There are now for them no barriers round the mount of God. *And they saw the God of Israel, and there was under His feet,* instead of a blazing mountain shaken to its base, *a paved work of sapphire stone,* and instead of blackness and cloud *as it were the very heaven for clearness.* *And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand ; and they beheld God, and did eat and drink.* There, in the picture, they are left ; because, in the reality, when the redeemed and saved, the people of God's covenant, see God in heaven, they shall no more go out.

¹ Heb. ix. 18-22.

² Deut. xxxiii. 29.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PRESENCE OF GOD.

IN the last chapter the history of the Israelites was seen to illustrate the meaning of being in covenant with God, the privileges and responsibilities attaching to the position, the way in which we enter into and abide in such a covenant, and finally the blessed future to which it is the prelude and introduction. We left the covenanters on the mountain with God, but, of course, in the actual history they descended; and we enter now on a fresh chapter in their experiences, which extends from chapter XXIV. 12 to the end of the book. This chapter has one subject, which we may describe as God dwelling amongst the covenant people. We shall here see how the blessing is announced, is forfeited, is regained, and finally is realized; and we shall find that the whole passage is instinct with the truth of our Emmanuel.

Some days after the events which have been described, Moses is again summoned to the mount to receive the tables of the law. On this occasion he takes Joshua with him as his minister, and leaves Aaron and Hur in charge of the camp, as the time of his stay in the mount is indefinite. If we read the account aright, Moses and Joshua stayed six days on the slope of Sinai, during the whole of which period the glory of Jehovah was visible to the congregation on the top of the mount, taking the appearance of *devouring fire*, either within or underneath a brooding cloud. On the seventh day God called to Moses out of the cloud, and leaving Joshua on the lower slopes, he himself went up into the midst of the cloud upon the summit. Here Moses remained forty days and forty nights, during which he received the Divine commands recorded in chapters XXV. to XXXI.

We seem to see that these commands were given in the form of seven distinct oracles.¹ The first of these oracles re-

¹ The phrase "Jehovah spake unto Moses" occurs seven times: xxv. 1; xxx. 11, 17, 22, 34; xxxi. 1, 12.

ferred to the preparation of a sanctuary in order that Jehovah might dwell among the Israelites.¹ Moses was first shown the pattern of all, and then instructed in detail as to the place and its furniture, the persons who should minister there and their equipment, and briefly also as to the nature of their daily service. In the following chapters we shall consider these directions in detail, when it will appear that the whole is made like the Son of God, Who was to become flesh and pitch His tabernacle amongst men, even Jesus our Emmanuel. Of the remaining six oracles, four seem to define the responsibilities of the Israelite when the Tabernacle was completed, and its Divine service in operation, and God actually dwelling amongst them. The first is the law of the atonement money. By this law whenever a census was taken of the children of Israel each man was to give half a shekel, no more and no less, as an offering to Jehovah; a ransom for their souls, to be used for the service of the Tent of Meeting. This must have taught the Israelite that his share in the atonement and reconciliation effected for Israel in the Tent of Meeting was contingent on his personal application for the benefit. The payment of the half shekel was not in itself the atonement, but it was the acknowledgment of a desire to share in the atoning service of the sanctuary and the means by which that desire was fulfilled. This personal acknowledgment was required whenever a man was to be reckoned as an Israelite; and his being so reckoned was contingent on its taking place. The law of the atonement money becomes in this way a striking picture of the New Testament teaching that the atonement made by our Lord Jesus Christ becomes effectual to one who believes. It is no mere *opus operatum* which is universally beneficial irrespective of human will and individual application: the atonement is indeed made for us, but it must be accepted by us; the rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, but personal adhesion to the Saviour and to His service is required from all alike to make atonement for their souls. The three following oracles are all concerned with the service of the sanctuary. The first is with regard to the laver of brass. This was used in the daily service of the priests, and emphasized the need of purity in all those who draw near to God. Its mention here is no doubt in connection with what has immediately preceded. The Israelite who had paid his atonement money

¹ Ch. xxv, 8.

was already assured of an interest in the atoning service of the sanctuary; he was now to be reminded of the claims which such an interest made upon him in daily life, for though Aaron and his sons were set apart for daily service in the Tent of Meeting, the whole people were a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, and the rule of the sanctuary was in a true sense also the rule of daily life. The oracle then, occurring in this context, is no mere ritual direction, but is vitally connected with the truth that sanctification accompanies justification, and that those who have believed in God must be careful to maintain good works, cleansing themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit. The remaining oracles refer to the oil, with which the whole sanctuary and all its vessels were anointed, and to the incense which was prepared for use within the tent. It was ordained that these two substances were to be used for no other purpose whatever, but were to be wholly consecrated to the service of Jehovah. These two oracles again, taken in connection with what precedes, will have carried a lesson for the devout Israelite. He must have perceived that the presence of God not only conveyed an assurance of ransom and atonement certainly effected, and a general obligation of purity of heart and life, but that it demanded an entire surrender of that which had been offered to His service. The consecrating material was to be used only in connection with the Divine service, the gift which was offered to God in the Tent of Meeting could be diverted to no other purpose. And when we see, as we shall see later, that the holy anointing oil is a picture of the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit, while the holy incense is manifestly symbolic of the service of prayer, we shall perceive the necessity of these two oracles in completing the picture of Christian service. It was necessary that there should be some reference to the Divine Influence which not only sanctified the true Tabernacle and Priest, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, but which sanctifies also all priestly service of His people offered in His name; as well as to the great truth that the devotion which God requires from the ransomed spirit must be whole-hearted and entire, submitting itself wholly to His holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve Him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of its life. There still remain two oracles of the seven. The first is a promise that God's Holy Spirit will enable His chosen workmen to complete His design for a dwelling-place amongst the people: *according to all that I have commanded thee shall they do*. The persons who were to carry out the

work were named by God ; the wisdom and skill which they and their assistants required would be bestowed by His Spirit, and so the work would be accomplished. The co-operation of man with the design of God, under the overshadowing power of the Holy Spirit, would avail for the realization of God's presence with Israel. It is evident, as we shall see later in more detail, that we have here a prophetic anticipation of the Christian verity that God became manifest in the flesh by the power of the Holy Ghost, and through the co-operation of the Virgin Mary. The last of these oracles reiterates the command to the Israelites to keep the Sabbaths of Jehovah, as a sign between His people and Himself, and so that they might experience His sanctifying grace. We take this command in direct connection with the preceding promise. We have seen above that the obligation to purity is put in close conjunction with the promise of atonement ; and so here the co-operation of human will is put in immediate connection with the covenanted presence of Jehovah. It is not enough that God dwells among men, but men must preserve their alliance with Him, and thus united with God they *shall know* (or *experience*) *that He is Jehovah who sanctifies them.*

On the conclusion of this Divine colloquy, at the end of the forty days, Moses was presented with the two stone tablets on which were written with the finger of God the Ten Words spoken from Mount Sinai in the day of the covenant.

Meanwhile Israel at the foot of the mount, and solely on account of Moses' long absence, had thrown everything away. Jehovah, whose eye had watched the whole, told the whole to Moses. *Go, get thee down, thy people have corrupted themselves ; they have made a molten calf ; they have worshipped it ; they have sacrificed to it ; they have said, These are thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.* The tale of deliberate turning aside out of the way which had been so lately commanded them was complete, and Moses is speechless. Once more Jehovah breaks the silence. *I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people : now therefore let Me alone, that My wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them ; and I will make of thee a great nation.* Here is the Gospel. Israel is turned aside, is corrupted, is stiff-necked, and Moses cannot find a word to say in their defence. Unless Jehovah breaks the silence there is no hope of recovery. But Jehovah speaks and makes known a way of salvation. *Let Me alone,* says the voice of God to Moses, *that My wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them, and I will make*

of thee a great nation. So then it is possible for Moses to hinder the heat of God's anger; but if Moses does so he must lose himself. The choice is before him, either to "let God alone," and, while Israel is consumed, himself to become a great nation; or else to hinder that righteous anger, standing in the breach for Israel. Moses does not hesitate, for he has the mind of Christ; he is acting and moving now under the influence of the Spirit of Christ; forgetting his own things he interposes to save the lost. *Moses besought Jehovah his God, Jehovah, why doth Thy wrath wax hot against Thy people which Thou hast brought forth?* Ah, but there is reason indeed; remember then Thy own holy Name, turn and repent; remember too Thy servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; remember Thy oath to them. *And Jehovah repented,* acknowledging the plea. Even so are we saved that the Name of God be not blasphemed by hostile powers of darkness; and by the Eye of Divine Justice being turned away from ourselves to the promise made before times eternal to the true Servant of Jehovah. The people then would not be consumed, so much at least Moses had obtained; and he turned and descended the mountain.

In his hand were the two tablets of stone with their testimony against the sin of idolatry, and their declaration of the jealousy of Jehovah. The tablets were the work of God, and their writing was the writing of God, even as the words had first been spoken in the hearing of the people by the voice of God. With the words of God's wrath still ringing in his ears, and the ground burning with fire beneath his feet,¹ Moses makes his way down the mountain. He rejoins Joshua, and together they drew near to the camp, where he saw—in violent contrast to all his deepest feeling—singing and dancing! *And Moses' anger waxed hot; and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath the mount;* in involuntary sympathy with Divine Justice and the Decree that all the covenant was at an end. He took their sin, and beat it down, and ground it to dust, and scattered it on the waters that they drank. In all this vehement anger against the unprovoked disobedience and shameless rebellion of Israel, Moses was a true picture of the Christ. He who can lay down his life for the sinner is jealous against sin. He is in as deep sympathy with the hot anger of Divine Justice as he is with the warm fervour of Divine Love. The weak excuse of Aaron only

¹ Deut, ix, 15.

throws the strong attitude of Moses into bolder relief. Of him too it might be written, *The zeal of Thine house hath even consumed me.*

But Moses' work is not yet over. The assembly is scattered, and the miserable object of their worship battered down, but the lanes of the camp are still full of unsobered revellers. Moses grasps the position; he takes his stand in the gate of the camp, and calls for all who are *on Jehovah's side* to come to him. Levi responds to the call and receives a commission, *Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel, go to and fro from gate to gate throughout the camp, and without fear or favour slay every one who is still abroad. And the sons of Levi did so, and there perished that day three thousand men.* But the whole camp was saved, and there fell a great silence, a deep awe, the prelude one might hope of repentance, and so of final salvation. We learn that pride and persistence in sin are an absolute barrier to salvation; Moses could do nothing while this lasted. And so night closed upon the camp of Israel, sobered if not yet repentant.

When the morning broke Moses said to the people, *Ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto Jehovah: peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin.* He did not tell them of the resolve to which he had come, nor did he feel at all sure of success in that supreme sacrifice which was in his mind, but *he returned to Jehovah and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin and have made them gods of gold. Yet now if Thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray Thee, out of Thy book which Thou hast written.* How deeply had Moses now entered into the mind of Christ, how supremely he was at this moment under the influence of the Spirit of Christ. Moses on this occasion, and St. Paul in later years,¹ came as near to our Lord Jesus as it is possible for men to come; but neither could do what He did, for they were but individual men, and could not give themselves a ransom for many. That must be reserved for One who would take Human Nature into the Godhead, and so bear the sins of the world. For all individual members of the sinful race the necessary principle stands true, *Whosoever hath sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book.* But the prayer which was prompted by the mind of the Holy Spirit in Moses, and which foreshadowed—may we even reverently say which reminded Jehovah of His own secret purpose towards mankind?—this prayer did not go

¹ Rom ix. 3.

unanswered. *Now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee; behold, Mine angel shall go before thee; nevertheless in the day when I visit, I will visit their sin upon them.* With this word Moses was fain to return to the camp. His suggested sacrifice was of no avail to meet the case: and God commenced to visit the sin of the people upon them. *Jehovah smote the people, because they made the calf which Aaron made.* The action suggests to us that some realization of the sinfulness of sin is a necessary accompaniment of salvation.

At this point in the narrative there appears to be a pause, as if the Divine judgments were given time to work their salutary effect. We gather from the account in Deuteronomy, where Moses recalls the events of these ever-to-be-remembered days, that he remained in the camp on this occasion for forty days and forty nights.¹ He tells us how he *fell down before Jehovah* through all that period, and prayed with fasting both for Aaron and for the people. Total and immediate destruction had indeed been averted, but the whole tabernacle scheme was in abeyance, God's judgments were daily falling in the camp, no promise of forgiveness had been vouchsafed, the future seemed wrapped in uncertainty. Moses was *afraid of the anger and hot displeasure wherewith Jehovah was wroth to destroy the people*; but he continued to intercede on their behalf; and meanwhile their hearts were softening. Once more Jehovah comes to the assistance of His people; an intervention which we imagine to have been towards the close of this solemn forty days of trial. Jehovah speaks again to Moses: *Depart, go up hence, thou and thy people that thou hast brought up out of the land of Egypt, unto the land of which I sware unto Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, Unto thy seed will I give it: and I will send an angel before thee, and I will drive out the nations: unto a land flowing with milk and honey; for I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiff-necked people; lest I consume thee in the way.* Surely Divine Love speaks here, and light begins to pierce through the gloom. There is once more mention of the oath, which Moses had been pleading; there is promise of an angel's guidance in the way; there is the assurance of victory over their enemies; there is a picture of the good and pleasant land awaiting them. Yes, even in the resolve *I will not go up in the midst of thee*, there shines a light of Divine compassion;

¹ Deut. ix. 18-20, 25-29.

for the reason is not an unwillingness on the part of Jehovah, but solicitude for the stiff-necked people, *lest I consume thee by the way*. Still this one expressed resolve stamps the whole as *evil tidings*; when the people heard these evil tidings they mourned; and no man did put on him his ornaments. This surely was pleasing to God, and is a sign that the love of God was softening their hearts; for Israel is not only sorry for their sins, but above all things desire the presence of Jehovah. Jehovah speaks again, *Say unto the children of Israel, Ye are a stiff-necked people: if I go up into the midst of thee for one moment I shall consume thee: therefore now put off thy ornaments from thee, that I may know what to do unto thee*. Here Divine Love draws nearer still; the former resolve is laid on one side, and hope that love will find out a way shines through the message. Hearts are humbled further, and *the children of Israel stripped themselves of their ornaments from Mount Horeb onward*.

During all these days there was not only the voice of God speaking to the people, and leading them to a heartfelt and deep repentance; but there was also a sign that Israel had not finally lost the presence of God. Moses *used to take the Tent*, that is no doubt the special Tent in which he had been accustomed to receive the Divine oracles, and where also perhaps he had in the name of God issued commands to the elders,¹ *and to pitch it without the camp, afar off from the camp, and he called it, the Tent of Meeting*, the name which God had already applied to the Tabernacle.² This was a clear sign of the removal of the Divine Presence from the camp of Israel. But yet there was not a final and total loss of that Presence. *It came to pass, that every one that sought Jehovah went out unto the Tent of Meeting, which was without the camp*. So the way of access was still open to every one who sought Jehovah. And Moses in the camp remained as a link between the people and their justly offended God, while Joshua, the unsinning Israelite, *departed not out of the tent*. It is significant of the attitude of the people at this time that their hopes and attention were fixed upon Moses. *When Moses went out unto the Tent all the people rose up, and stood, every man at his tent door, and looked after Moses until he was gone into the tent*. There

¹ Cf. ch. xvi. 9, 10, where Israel is summoned to draw near "before Jehovah"; and ch. xviii. 7-12, where Jethro hears "in the Tent" the account of the Exodus from Egypt, and there, apparently, worships God by sacrifice. There also perhaps "Moses sat to judge the people".

² Ch. xxvii. 21, etc.

the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door of the Tent, and Jehovah spoke with Moses *as a man speaketh unto his friend*. *And all the people saw the pillar of cloud stand at the door of the Tent ; and all the people rose up and worshipped, every man at his tent door*. So that Moses, living still in the camp, had also access to the presence of Jehovah, and upon him the hopes of the people were now fixed. The great reason for atonement is still in the shadow, though well known to Jehovah Himself ; but all the other elements of salvation are here. There is the Divine willingness, and drawing near ; there is humbleness of heart and longing anticipation on the part of men. All that is needed now is intercession by the man whom God has chosen. This also is not wanting.

The prayer of Moses breathes a sense of confidence. In those colloquys within the Tent of Meeting he had been assured that his mediation was successful. *Thou hast said, I know thee by name, and thou hast found favour in my sight*. The fastings and prayers of those forty days had not been in vain ; God had accepted him. But God had lately spoken of "an angel" who should go before Israel, but, unlike the angel of which the earlier promise had spoken,¹ the presence of this angel was not equivalent to the presence of God Himself. And it is for a distinct assurance of this Divine Presence that Moses now prays. *Thou hast not let me know whom Thou wilt send with me. If I have found favour in Thy sight show me now Thy ways*, declare to me Thy plan for the reconciliation of which I am now assured, *that I may know Thee, to the end that I may find favour in Thy sight ; and consider that this nation is Thy people*. And He said, *My presence shall go, and I will give thee rest*. And Moses replied, *If Thy presence go not, carry us not up hence. For wherein shall it be known that I have found favour in Thy sight, I and Thy people ? is it not in that Thou goest with us, so that we are separated, I and Thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth ?*

In these words Moses identifies himself with Israel, *I have found favour, I and Thy people : we are separated, I and Thy people*. He has won back for those from whom he refused to be separated the abiding presence of Jehovah ; and the reality of the presence is to be known to all the people that are upon the face of the earth, for *Jehovah said unto Moses, I will do this thing also that thou hast spoken ; for thou hast found favour*

¹ Contrast ch. xxxiii. 2, 3 with ch. xxiii. 20-23.

in My sight, and I know thee by name. It is impossible to miss the significance of it all. Moses plainly speaks and acts here under the influence of the Spirit of Christ, and treads closely in His steps. And indeed he seems conscious that by his experiences he is penetrating into the secrets of the glory of the Divine character. *Show me now Thy ways, that I may know thee, to the end that I may* (still further) *find favour in Thy sight*, he had prayed before; *Show me, I pray Thee, Thy glory*, he prays now. And this prayer too was answered.

The manner in which the glory of Jehovah was manifested to Moses is deeply significant. St. Paul has taught us how the declaration, *I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy*, expresses a painfully mysterious, but to the humble believer an unspeakably restful truth of salvation.¹ Meanwhile *the face of God* cannot be seen. This is no meeting of equals, it is the contact of creature with Creator, and of sinful man with his holy Judge. But *there is a place by Me, and thou shalt stand upon the rock; and it shall come to pass, while My glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with My hand until I have passed by; and I will take away My hand, and thou shalt see My back; but My face shall not be seen.* We take this to mean that not only would Moses' prayer to know God in His ways be answered, but that he would very soon receive a sacrament of the promise. There was a place on Mount Sinai which God would point out to him. There he would stand upon the rock, and God would make a display of His glory pass by that place. But while this passed by, Moses would be hidden in a cleft of the rock, the mouth of which would be closed by Divine power, so that he could not see the shining pageant. But when it had passed by, the restraining influence would be removed, and he would see the glory in departing. Meanwhile the Name of Jehovah would be proclaimed in his hearing, and no doubt a deep insight into the meaning of the words would be conveyed to his heart. But we are concerned now with the outward and visible sign, which no doubt took place exactly as foretold, although in the following chapter it is not again described. After all the sign was for Moses, and what appearance actually passed by, and what sight met Moses' eyes when the Lord's covering hand was removed, are not essential to our understanding of the symbol. We know enough to see the

¹ Rom. ix. 15, 16.

picture of our Christ. Once more He appears as the Rock ; again He is shown as cleft ; we stand upon the rock, and hide within the cleft, and there we see what man may see of God. As before Jehovah stood upon the Rock, so here *Jehovah descended in the cloud and stood in that place that was by Him*, where Moses' feet were planted ; and His Hand closed the cleft that sheltered that mortal man from the blaze of Divine Glory. So indeed the Rock and the Cleft alike are shown to be Jehovah Himself ; and we know that when we rely on Jesus we rely on Jehovah, and that the blood of Calvary is the blood of God.¹

But we must return to the history. Moses was directed to prepare for the coming restoration of the broken covenant. He was to prepare two tablets like the first, and, while all others were excluded from the mount, he was to present himself again to Jehovah on its summit. There he would receive his promised sign, and there the covenant would be renewed. All this Moses did, and the words that he heard, and *all the goodness of Jehovah* which passed by before him, he has recorded for our learning, though the sight that he saw is not told us. *Jehovah passed by before him, and proclaimed, Jehovah, Jehovah, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness and truth ; keeping lovingkindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin ; and that will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation.* This is the goodness of the Lord which reaches and touches the heart of all who are hidden in JESUS. And Moses seized the golden hour. He *made haste and bowed his head toward the earth and worshipped ; and he said, If now I have found favour in Thy sight, O Lord, let the Lord, I pray Thee, go in the midst of us ; for it is a stiff-necked people, and therefore needs a pardoning God ; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for Thine inheritance.*

No longer was there any hesitancy ; the whole which had been lost was now restored. Moses remained again upon the mount forty days and forty nights, and Israel this time could wait for him ; again he heard and wrote a renewed summary of the words of the covenant ; once more he received the tablets written with the finger of God, and with these in his hands and the reflected glory in his face he re-

¹ Acts xx. 28.

turned to Israel. He calls Israel to him, and he passes freely between them and God, and God and them, the Mediator who has won back for them the presence of God.

With gladness the now reconciled people offer the material to make the sanctuary; the chosen workmen come forward and the promised Spirit is upon them; the willing hearts are moved, and the wise spirits are wholly at God's service, and the work is completed, the tabernacle reared up. *Then the cloud covered the Tent of Meeting, and the glory of Jehovah filled the tabernacle. The Cloud of Jehovah was upon the tabernacle by day, and there was fire therein by night, in the sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys.* This Lord remained with Israel until Emmanuel came, and He is with us all the days even unto the end of the world.

CHAPTER VII.

THE TABERNACLE AND ALTAR.

WE have now concluded our review of the progress of revelation up to the time when the sacrificial law was given. However rapid and incomplete it has been, we cannot fail to have been impressed with the fact that the whole has a direct bearing upon the work of the Son of God : and indeed that both history and record have again and again been *made like Him*. But we have reserved for more detailed treatment that which forms the setting of the whole sacrificial system, namely, the Tabernacle and the Priesthood. To these we must now direct our attention ; and in this way we shall be led to a deepened conviction that in all these things Moses indeed wrote of Him.¹

In our examination of these two subjects we will not confine ourselves to what is recorded in the Book of Exodus.² We shall endeavour to gather from all sources as full a description of the Tabernacle and of the Priesthood as we can, and then to indicate what we believe to be their spiritual significance. It is important to ascertain as far as possible the actual facts ; and for this purpose we shall refer, as occasion arises, to other parts of the sacred record which throw light on what is obscure in the account in Exodus.

We must remember with regard to the directions for making the Tabernacle and its furniture in this account, that Moses was first shown the pattern of the whole, and then given these directions. At the beginning God announces His purpose to show Moses this pattern ; the words indeed seem to have been spoken as Moses was about to be conducted, as we may suppose in vision, through a pattern Tabernacle. *According to all that I show thee, the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the furniture thereof, even so shall ye make it.* We believe that Moses was then and there conducted through such a Tabernacle, perhaps by angelic ministry, like Ezekiel

¹ John v. 46.

² Chs. xxv.-xxvii, and xxxv.-xxxviii ; cf. also Num. iii. and iv.

and John in later years ; and to this detailed view the subsequent directions constantly refer ; *See that thou make them after their pattern which hath been showed thee in the mount.*¹ This will account for the omission of many details, some of which we may be able to supply from elsewhere, while the restoration of others must remain conjectural. It will be found, however, that no spiritual significance attaches to what still remains uncertain, after comparison of all available scriptural authorities. The main facts, and indeed everything which can be thought to be of symbolic importance, are clear to patient investigation. The discovery in our day, of what was common knowledge in the time of Moses, that cubits of different lengths were in use for different purposes of measurement, has thrown a flood of light upon the problem of the restoration of the Tabernacle. This discovery we owe to the Rev. W. Shaw Caldecott. In these pages we will do no more than state his conclusions, referring the reader for further information to Mr. Caldecott's various works on the sacred buildings of the Jews. It appears then that there were three kinds of cubit, of 3, 4, and 5 handbreadths' length² respectively. These we shall call the small, the medium, and the large cubit. The small cubit was the goldsmith's measure, and was used for measuring precious metals. The large cubit was the surveyor's measure, used in land and area measurements. The medium cubit was the ordinary measure for all other purposes. Applying to the specifications in Exodus the appropriate cubit length in each case, the restoration of the Tabernacle, which has hitherto presented insuperable obstacles, becomes simple and convincing.

In our description we shall begin from the outside, and gradually work our way into the interior.

THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE.


When the glory of Jehovah was about to be manifested upon Mount Sinai, bounds were set about the mountain to sanctify it ; and so, now, when the glory was to find its home among the people, directions were given to enclose a space about it. The dimensions of this space are given as 100 cubits long east and west, and 50 cubits broad north and south.³ We take this accordingly to be the large or surveyor's cubit, even though it is applied in the context also to the length of the hangings,⁴ a statement which if it had stood

¹ Ch. xxv. 9 ; with xxv. 40 ; xxvi. 30 ; xxvii. 8.

² The standard handbreadth is 3·6 inches.

³ Ch. xxvii. 18.

⁴ Ch. xxvii. 9.



GROUND PLAN OF THE TABERNACLE COURT.

alone, we should have been compelled to interpret as referring to medium cubits. The interpretation of the court measurement as the large cubit will be confirmed as we proceed. On each of the north and south sides there were twenty pillars, and on the west side there were ten pillars. On the east side the arrangement was different. Four pillars were set up at a certain distance from the line of the eastern side to support a screen of twenty large cubits' length, which stood before the open entrance to the court. The distance at which this screen was placed is not mentioned, and very probably varied with circumstances. On either side of the entrance and in the line of the eastern side three pillars were placed. There were thus twenty pillars on the north and on the south sides, ten on the west side, and six on the east, leaving in the middle of the east side a gap of twenty large cubits. If we assume a distance of five large cubits between two adjacent pillars, a reference to the accompanying plan will show that there is one pillar too few completely to encircle the four sides of the court, with the exception of the gap at the entrance on the eastern side. There must then have been a second gap somewhere. This we shall show immediately to have been on the north side of the court, and almost certainly in its exact centre, as shown in the plan. The fifty-six pillars are thus all accounted for, and completely encircle the court at distances of five large cubits from one another, leaving two spaces for entrance, one of ten large cubits in the middle of the northern side, and one of twenty large cubits in the middle of the eastern side, a screen being placed at some little distance in front of the latter, supported upon four pillars.

Though not expressly stated, these sixty pillars were probably made of acacia wood; and they were adorned with fillets and hooks of silver. They were fixed in sockets of brass, and held in position by cords fastened to pegs of brass. Upon these pillars were stretched hangings of fine twined linen, their height being five cubits, which we take to be the same as the other cubits in the immediate context,¹ namely, the large cubit of five handbreadths or 18 inches. Sufficient hangings were provided to enclose the whole court with the exception of the eastern entrance.

The screen for the eastern gate of the court was of blue and purple and scarlet and fine twined linen, of embroidered work.

¹ Ch. xxvii. 18.

The court seems not to have been divided, but at the same time the Tabernacle and its covering Tent were situated in the western half, while the altar was placed in its eastern half, the western edge of the latter being almost certainly upon the bisecting line of the court, immediately opposite the middle point of the northern entrance. Some have supposed that at this point there was some further line of demarcation, such as a line of posts, so that the western half might be confined to the priests, while the people worshipped in the eastern half; and since the northern opening was situated partly in one and partly in the other, entrance might be made through it by both priests and people. However this may be, it is noticeable that the whole place is always spoken of in the singular number as *the court*. It is not until the Temple is about to be built that we read of *the courts*, and this only in the account of the later Chronicler.¹ If Psalm LXV. 4 was written by David before the Temple was planned, it is a solitary instance of the use of the plural in connection with the Tabernacle court, and the expression may refer to the two sacred places which then existed, one at Gibeon and one on Mount Zion.² At the same time it was ordained that no Israelite should come near to the Tent,³ while they were not denied access to the altar, so that the western half of the court must soon have acquired a peculiar sanctity, even if no actual partition existed.

THE DOOR OF THE TENT OF MEETING.

We have seen already that there was a second entrance to the Tabernacle court besides that at its eastern end. This is the entrance which is very frequently referred to as *The Door of the Tent of Meeting*.⁴ We read also of a *Door of the Tabernacle*,⁵ a *Door of the Tent*,⁶ and a *Door of the Tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting*,⁷ which all refer to the entrance to the Tabernacle proper, and must be carefully distinguished from the Door of the Tent of Meeting. Out of some fifty passages

¹ 1 Chron. xxiii. 27, 28; xxviii. 6, 12; compare 2 Sam. vii. 13, 14.

² 1 Chron. xvi. 37-42. Here and elsewhere in this book we shall assume that Psalms ascribed to David in their headings were actually written by him. Though these headings are no part of the original text, they represent a very ancient tradition; and on purely critical grounds also the Davidic authorship of Psalms ascribed to him has been ably argued. See the "Student's Handbook to the Psalms" by Sharpe.

³ Num. i. 51-54; xviii. 22.

⁴ The word here used for *door* would more properly be translated *entrance*, and so in the other phrases quoted. The distinctions referred to in this passage are obliterated in the Authorized Version, but may easily be verified by reference to the Revised Version.

⁵ Exod. xxxv. 15.

⁶ *Ib.* xxxvi. 37.

⁷ *Ib.* xl. 6.

where this latter phrase occurs, there are only three in which it does not indicate an entrance to the court; and in each of these three passages there is something in the context to fix its reference to what is elsewhere termed the Door of the Tent.¹ We meet with the phrase also outside the Books of Moses, as for example in Josh. XIX. 51, where Eleazar with Joshua and the heads of fathers' houses divided the land by lot *at the door of the tent of meeting*; or in 1 Sam. II. 22, where we read of women who did service *at the door of the tent of meeting*. It is clear that these things could not have taken place at the entrance to the tent itself; they undoubtedly refer to an entrance of the court. This name persisted to the time of Solomon, and was applied to one of the Temple gates. In 1 Chron. IX. 21 we read that amongst the Temple gate-keepers one Zechariah *was porter of the door of the tent of meeting*; and in chapter XXVI. 14 we read of him that *his lot came out northward*; so that we gain a clear additional testimony to the fact that in the Tabernacle court this name had been applied to a northern entrance. Once more on turning to the great vision of Ezekiel, we read that the prophet was brought to the entrance of *the gate of the inner court that looketh toward the north*, and this gate is immediately called *the gate of the altar*,² the reason being that on passing through this gate access was at once obtained to the brazen altar.³ We gain additional confirmation of the view that in the court of the Tabernacle there was an entrance on the north side, and that it was immediately opposite the altar.⁴ When this fact has been firmly established many references to this entrance in the Books of Moses become intelligible. For example, the consecration of Aaron and his sons took place here, and *the congregation was assembled at the door of the tent of meeting* for the celebration of the rite.⁵ It is further stated that on this occasion Aaron and his sons did not go out of the door of the Tent of Meeting for seven days, which indicates that they remained within the Tabernacle court. It was in this place also that women assembled to minister;⁶ busied no doubt in connection with the cleansing of the place, or with the fires connected with the sacrifices, which were all brought to this door,⁷ and also perhaps with the repair of the materials of the Tent.

¹ The three passages are Exod. xxxviii. 30, 31; Num. iii. 25; iv. 25.

² Ezek. viii. 3, 5.

³ *Ib.* ix. 1, 2.

⁴ So in Exod. xxix. 42, Lev. i. 5, the altar is said to have been at this door.

⁵ Exod. xxix. 4, 11, 32; Lev. viii. 4.

⁶ Exod. xxxviii. 8.

⁷ Lev. i. 3, 5; iii. 2; iv. 4, 7, 18; xii. 6; xiv. 11, 23; xv. 14, 29; xvi. 7; xvii. 4, 5, 6, 9; xix. 21; Num. vi. 10, 13, 18.

In the first chapter of Leviticus, when giving direction for offering the burnt-offering, it is directed that if the offering was a bullock it was to be slain *at the door of the tent of meeting*; if a sheep or goat it was slain *on the side of the altar northward*; if a bird it was brought *unto the altar*; which seems to imply that the door of the Tent of Meeting was north of the altar. In Ezekiel's temple we also find arrangements for the slaughter of sacrifices in and around the northern gate.¹ The part of the court adjacent to the Altar and Tabernacle was in a special sense a *holy place*, and here the priests were accustomed to eat the most holy things.² Turning to the Book of Numbers we learn that when the people were assembled in response to the silver trumpets it was *at the door of the tent of meeting* that they came together.³ To this place also Korah assembled all the congregation against Moses and Aaron;⁴ but in the twentieth chapter, when the people again assembled against their leaders, it was probably on the east of the court, where Moses and Aaron were encamped, because we are told that they *went from the presence of the assembly to the door of the tent of meeting*.⁵ Once more we read that on the occasion of Israel's great sin at Shittim, the whole congregation were *weeping at the door of the tent of meeting*;⁶ and again that the daughters of Zelophehad stood before Moses and Eleazar, the princes, and all the congregation, in this place.⁷

On the whole then we conclude with certainty that on the north side of the court there was an entrance called the entrance of the Tent of Meeting, opposite to the altar; and that all who desired to meet with God in sacrificial worship entered the court by this way; and further that the neighbourhood of this entrance was a place of assembly.

This opening was not closed by a screen, but apparently by a continuation of the ordinary hangings of white linen which enclosed the court elsewhere.⁸ These might have been like them⁹ suspended from a cord attached to the adjacent pillars, but in this case so arranged as to be either drawn aside or taken down when the entrance was in use. Perhaps this entrance was closed by doors and not by hangings in the Tabernacle of Eli's time, and these were some of the *doors of the house of Jehovah* which young Samuel opened.¹⁰

¹ Ezek. xl. 35-43.² Lev. x. 12, 13.³ Num. x. 3.⁴ *Ib.* xvi. 19, and cf. verses 42, 43, 50.⁵ *Ib.* xx. 2-6.⁶ *Ib.* xxv. 6.⁷ *Ib.* xxvii. 2.⁸ This is implied in Exod. xxvii. 11.⁹ The cords of the hangings are mentioned in Num. iv. 26.¹⁰ 1 Sam. iii. 15.

When the Tabernacle was removed, the hangings of the court and the screen at the east entrance, with all their cords and attachments, were the charge of the Levite family of Gershon; while the pillars and their sockets, with their pegs and cords, were the responsibility of the Merarites.

THE ALTAR OF BURNT-OFFERING.

Within the court there were two chief objects, the Tabernacle under its Tent, and the Altar, so that it is not only spoken of as *the Court of the Tabernacle*,¹ but also as *the Court which is by the Tabernacle and by the Altar*.² The laver indeed was situated between the two, but as we shall see later its use and significance were entirely subordinate to these. *The Altar of Burnt-offering* was made of acacia wood, five medium cubits in length and breadth, and three medium cubits in height. It was in the form of a box without lid or bottom, and at each top corner the wood was extended in the form of a horn. The whole was plated with brass, within and without; and all its pots and shovels for the removal of ashes, its basins, flesh-hooks, firepans and other vessels were made of brass, so that it is often called *the Brazen Altar*. The height of the altar being only three medium cubits, or 3·6 English feet, it is clear that the priest standing by its side could easily place the victim upon the altar fire. But in the account of the first offering of sacrifices by Aaron we read that *he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings*,³ which seems to imply that the place where Aaron had been standing was raised above the people. The explanation is no doubt that the brazen altar was not set upon the ground, but on a platform, just as after the return from the captivity *they set the altar upon its base*.⁴ A short time before the directions for making the brazen altar were given, and as a part of the covenant into which Israel had just entered, it was ordained that the altar for the service of Jehovah should be made of earth or of unhewn stones, and that they should not mount to it by steps.⁵ We conclude that these directions still held good, and that the brazen altar was intended to be placed upon such a base, the approach to which would be by an inclined plane. From the analogy of the Temples which afterwards took the place of the Tabernacle, we assume that there were two inclined planes, one from the east and one from the south, by which approach was

¹ Exod. xxvii. 9.

² Num. iv. 26.

³ Lev. ix. 22.

⁴ Ezra iii. 3; Heb. "bases".

⁵ Exod. xx. 24-26.

made to the altar of brass. The existence of this platform base being rather implied than stated, we are left to conjecture as to its size. It has been supposed that it might have been fifteen medium cubits square and two medium cubits high. The brazen altar being placed in the centre of this base would leave a space of five medium cubits, or six feet, on every side for the priests to move freely in their ministrations; and the altar itself, including its base, would be a perfect cube of six feet. In what follows we shall assume this to have been the case, and the platform of the altar will then have protruded a distance of five medium cubits into the western half of the court. The most difficult part of the altar to understand is its grating of brass, which is described in these words: *Thou shalt make for it a grating of network of brass; and upon the net shalt thou make four brazen rings in the four corners thereof. And thou shalt put it under the ledge round the altar beneath, that the net may reach halfway up the altar.*¹ In a subsequent chapter the additional circumstance is added that *the four rings for the four ends of the grating of brass were to be places for the staves.*² Happily the correct interpretation of these directions is not for us a matter of importance. It must have been clear to Moses from his view of the pattern what is referred to as *the ledge* of the altar, and in what way the grating was to be *put under the ledge*, but for us it must remain a matter of conjecture. The most plausible suggestion is that halfway down the brazen altar inside, and just below a ledge which ran round the altar at that place, a brass grating was fixed, through which, as we may suppose, the ashes fell to the ground beneath. It does not seem likely that the altar was removed when the ashes were to be taken away, but that there was an opening in the base (probably on the northern side,³ the other three sides being occupied by the two ascents and by the laver) through which the ashes might be withdrawn. This opening beneath the brazen altar would also furnish the necessary draught. The four rings at the corners of the grating may have served the double purpose of receiving the staves by which the altar was borne, and of being the means by which the grating could be lifted. If the grating was within the altar, as is here supposed, there must have been holes in the sides of the altar through which the staves were passed. But great uncertainty surrounds the whole question of this grating. The staves by

¹ Exod. xxvii. 4, 5.

² *Ib.* xxxviii. 5.

³ In Lev. i. 16 we read of *the place of the ashes* on the east of the altar; but it is not clear what is referred to.

which the altar was borne were made of acacia wood, and overlaid with brass.

The Altar of Burnt-offering was of equal sanctity with the Tabernacle. When the camp was to be moved the priests first removed the ashes from the altar, and then covered it with a purple cloth. They next placed upon the altar, so covered, all its instruments and vessels, spread a covering of sealskin over all, put in the staves, and gave it into the charge of the Kohathite family of Levites.

THE LAVER.

The laver was placed between the Altar of Burnt-offering and the Tabernacle. We have seen that the base of the altar occupied five medium cubits, or four large cubits of the western half of the court which was fifty large cubits in length. We shall see later that the Tent occupied thirty-two large cubits of this space, so that there are fourteen large cubits remaining in which to place the laver and to allow for a vacant space behind the Tabernacle. A reasonable conjecture allows a space behind the Tabernacle equal to the depth of the entrance-way in front of it, namely, ten medium or eight large cubits. This will then leave six large cubits or seven and a half medium cubits between the Tabernacle Tent and the Altar in which to place the Laver. The dimensions of the Laver are not given in Scripture, but the dimensions of the molten sea, which took its place¹ in the Temple of Solomon, are given as ten medium cubits in diameter and five medium cubits in height.² It is not unreasonable to conclude that, as Solomon's altar of burnt-offering was double the size of the ancient altar in all its dimensions, the molten sea was also double the size of the laver. The laver may then have been five medium cubits in diameter, and we have seen that there was a space of seven and a half medium cubits in length in which to place it. The laver stood upon a base,³ the height of the whole being as we may suppose two and a half medium cubits. The brass used in the making of this vessel was the freewill offering of the women who ministered at the door of the Tent of Meeting,⁴ and consisted of the brass mirrors which they offered for the purpose. The laver was thus situated between the screen of the entrance to the Tent and the altar, leaving

¹ See 2 Chron. iv. 6. The ten lavers do not correspond to any of the *prescribed* furniture of the Tabernacle.

² 1 Kings vii. 23.

³ Exod. xxx. 18.

⁴ *Ib.* xxxviii. 8.

very little space between them on either side, and must then have been to a great extent concealed from view and overshadowed by these two chief objects within the court, although slightly higher than the base of the altar, if we have rightly conjectured the various heights. In fact the laver is to be distinguished both from the Tabernacle and its furniture and from the Altar. It was not used in the Service of God as those were, but held water for the ablutions of the priests when they approached either Tabernacle or altar.¹ Accordingly the laver finds no separate mention in the directions for moving the camp, but must have been included among *all the vessels of ministry wherewith they minister in the sanctuary* which were to be put by the priests in a cloth of blue, covered with sealskin, and placed on a frame, before being delivered to the Kohathites for carriage.²

THE TABERNACLE AND ITS TENT.

It is important to distinguish between the Tabernacle and its Tent. The distinction is clearly marked in the original, as for example in the account of the erection of the whole structure, where we read that *Moses reared up the tabernacle, and laid its sockets, and set up the boards thereof, and put in the bars thereof, and reared up its pillars. And he spread the tent over the tabernacle, and put the covering of the tent above upon it.*³

We shall consider first the Tabernacle and then its Tent.

I. THE TABERNACLE.

The Tabernacle was a dwelling-place with wooden walls on three sides, and an open entrance at its eastern end. The walls were made of acacia boards overlaid with gold,⁴ 10 medium cubits in height,⁵ and $1\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits in width. These boards were placed upright in rows to form the walls of the building. Each board was provided with two sockets of silver, each socket being a talent in weight, and also with two tenons to fix into these sockets. The sockets were either laid upon the ground, or sunk into it, and the boards fixed in them. There were twenty of these boards on each of the north and the south sides, and six on the west, and there were also two corner boards at the angles, each with two sockets, making

¹ Exod. xxx. 17-21. The priests washed at, not in, the laver.

² Num. iv. 12.

³ Exod. xl. 18, 19.

⁴ *Ib.* xxxvi. 34.

⁵ The measurement is given in connection with the wooden boards, and therefore is to be taken as referring to the medium cubit.

forty-eight boards in all, with ninety-six sockets. Rigidity was secured by making rings upon the boards outside, and running bars through them by which the whole was held together. Five of these bars were provided on each face, the middle bar of which ran from end to end of the side. The rings were made of gold, and the bars of acacia wood overlaid with gold. This will give an idea of the general appearance of the Tabernacle.

With regard to its dimensions it is not difficult to arrive at an accurate conclusion. Since there were twenty boards on each of the north and south sides, and each board was a medium cubit and a half in width, we find that the total length of these boards was 30 medium cubits. In the same way the length of the western side, where there were six boards, was 9 medium cubits. But to complete the calculation we must consider the corner boards, the dimensions of which are not actually stated. These boards are described in Exod. XXVI. 24, and we may imagine that they consisted of two solid pieces of acacia wood, each one cut to form an angle, and each with a face in the western wall, and also in the north or south walls respectively. The thickness of the boards is not given, but is stated by Josephus to have been one-third of a span, or small cubit, that is to say, one handbreadth. The width of each face of the corner boards may then be deduced in the following manner. The width of the Holy Place is assumed to have been one-half that of the Holy Place in the Temple, which was 20 medium cubits wide.¹ We thus have 10 medium cubits for the internal measurement of the western wall, 9 cubits of which are accounted for by the six boards, leaving half a medium cubit for the internal face of each corner board. The external face of each corner board on the western side will then be half a medium cubit plus the thickness of a board, that is plus a handbreadth. We further assume that the two faces of a corner board were equal in width, and the conclusion emerges that the internal measurements of the Tabernacle were $30\frac{1}{2}$ by 10 medium cubits;² and the external measurements were 30 medium cubits and three handbreadths on its northern and southern sides, and 10 medium cubits and two handbreadths on its western side.


It is clear from the account in Exodus that the Tabernacle was divided into two parts, called respectively *the Holy Place* and *the Most Holy*, by a veil; but it is not so clear where this

¹ 1 Kings vi. 20.


² I.e. 37.2×12 feet.

THE TABERNACLE AND ALTAR

79



1




2



e



3



Scale of medium Cubits

10 5

a. Western Tent-pole. b. Corner Board. c. Middle Tent-pole. d. Corner Board. e. Shape of Corner Board. f. Tent-poles. g. Holy of Holies. h. Veil with four pillars. i. Altar of Incense. l. Holy Place. m. Holy Table. n. Golden Candlestick. o. Entrance to the Tabernacle with five pillars. p. Screen of the Entrance.

1. Southern Elevation of Tabernacle. 2. Western Elevation of Tabernacle. 3. Ground Plan of Tabernacle.

veil was placed within the Tabernacle. In Exod. xxvi. 33 it is indeed said that the veil was *hung up under the clasps*, and some have thought that the clasps referred to must be those uniting the two sets of curtains which formed the covering of the Tabernacle. If so, as we shall see later, the veil must have divided the Tabernacle into two equal parts. But it is more likely that the proportion of the two corresponding chambers in the Temple was determined by the dimensions of these places in the Tabernacle. In the Temple the Holiest Place or Oracle was 20 medium cubits, and the Holy Place was 40 medium cubits in length.¹ We may then safely conclude that the corresponding measurements in the Tabernacle were 10 and 20 medium cubits respectively. In this case the clasps under which the veil was hung were not the clasps of the Tabernacle covering, but clasps of its own which Moses had seen in the pattern.

But if the combined length of the two chambers was 30 medium cubits, it would fall short of the entire internal measurement of the Tabernacle by half a medium cubit. This half cubit was no doubt occupied by certain pillars which are mentioned in the record. The veil which divided the Holy Place from the Most Holy was suspended from four pillars, and there were also certain pillars connected with the entrance to the Tabernacle on the east. If we allow a face of one handbreadth width for these pillars, supposing them to have been square, or a diameter of the same supposing them to have been round, the two rows of pillars standing within the Tabernacle walls will have occupied two handbreadths, or a medium half cubit of its length, leaving exactly 30 medium cubits for the two holy places.

THE VEIL OF THE TABERNACLE.

Between the Holy Place and the Most Holy, four pillars were placed in a row. These pillars were made of acacia wood and overlaid with gold, their hooks being also of gold, while the sockets in which they stood were of silver. These four sockets added to the ninety-six sockets of the Tabernacle walls made exactly one hundred sockets, of one talent's weight each. The silver used in their construction was part of the atonement money² paid when the congregation was numbered; the remainder being used for the silver hooks together with the silver fillets and overlaying of the capitals of the pillars of

¹ 1 Kings vi. 2, 16, 17, 20.

² Exod. xxxviii. 25-28.

the court. Upon the four pillars the veil was hung under its clasps. The veil itself was of blue and purple and scarlet and fine twined linen, richly embroidered *with cherubim the work of the skilful workman*. The meaning of this last phrase is given in Exod. xxxix. 3, where we read that *they did beat the gold into thin plates, and cut it into wires, to work it in the blue, and in the purple, and in the scarlet, and in the fine linen, the work of the skilful workman*. This fact is of importance in connection with the unit of measurement employed for the curtains covering the Tabernacle, which were of the same workmanship as the veil. The veil itself is often called *the Veil of the Screen*, or even simply *the Screen*,¹ because it *screened the ark of the testimony*.² When the camp was removed the priests took down the veil, and with it they covered the ark.

THE DOOR OF THE TABERNACLE.

The door or entrance to the tabernacle was, as we have seen, at its eastern end. This entrance had a screen in front of it, like the screen at the eastern entrance of the Tabernacle Court. At this entrance were also placed five pillars, which had points of resemblance with both the pillars of the veil and the pillars of the court. They resembled the former in being of acacia wood overlaid with gold, and their hooks also of gold; they resembled the latter in having sockets of brass instead of silver, and in being provided with capitals and fillets which are not mentioned in connection with the pillars of the veil. The capitals and fillets of the five pillars of the entrance were, however, overlaid with gold, while those of the pillars of the court were covered with silver. The exact position and use of these five pillars is not stated in the record, and it has been supposed by some that they stood in a row, and that the screen was suspended upon them. But though it is distinctly stated of the veil that it was hung upon its four pillars,³ there is no such direction with regard to the screen; and indeed if the pillars had been so placed at the eastern extremity of the tabernacle, there would have been a space of scarcely more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet between them, which would have been inconveniently small, and when the screen was pulled aside to allow of entrance, the interior of the tabernacle would have been exposed to view. And if they had been arranged in a row at a certain distance in front of the Tabernacle, there

¹ Num. iii. 31.

² Exod. xl. 21.

³ Ib. xxvi. 32.

would have been no support to the Tabernacle walls at their eastern extremities, which again seems unlikely. The record simply states that these five pillars were made *for the screen*, while the screen is made *for the entrance of the tent*. We believe then that this entrance was made up of the five pillars and the screen in the following manner. Just within the tabernacle walls we believe that three of the pillars were placed, connected no doubt above with cross bars, an arrangement which would support the tabernacle walls. The remaining two pillars were placed at a certain distance in front of these, and upon them the screen was stretched. The whole space enclosed by these five pillars and the screen was *the entrance of the tabernacle*. We shall see later that the whole length covered by the tent spread over the Tabernacle was $40\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, of which the Tabernacle itself occupied $30\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits. We can scarcely be wrong in concluding that the remaining 10 cubits give us the depth of the entrance to the tabernacle, and that the tabernacle and its entrance and screen were all under the tent covering. We find that in Solomon's Temple there was a *porch*¹ before the holy place which no doubt answered to this entrance of the tabernacle. The depth of that porch, which, like the tabernacle entrance, was as wide as the house itself, is stated to have been 10 cubits. In this case then the dimension of the old entrance is retained unchanged instead of being doubled, which may suggest to us that this space, though included under the tent covering, was no part of the tabernacle proper. The height of the pillars of the veil and of the pillars of the entrance is nowhere stated, but we may reasonably suppose that they were of the same height as the tabernacle walls.

The existence of this entrance may explain the fact that, while the priests only were allowed to enter the holy place, the records speak of Moses and Miriam, Joshua, and the elders of Israel, as either entering the tent or falling down before the ark.² All these things may have taken place under the tent covering in the entrance to the tabernacle.

The screen of the entrance was of blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen, the work of the embroiderer; exactly similar to the screen at the eastern entrance of the court, but differing from the veil of the sanctuary in the absence of gold.

¹ 1 Kings vi. 3.

² Lev. i. 1; Num. vii. 89; xii. 5; Deut. xxxi. 14, 15; Josh. vii. 6.

THE TEN CURTAINS OF THE TABERNACLE.

The workmanship of these curtains was the same as that of the veil of the sanctuary. They were made of fine twined linen embroidered with the three colours and with gold cherubim. On account of the gold which was employed in their construction the cubit of measurement in this case is taken to be the small cubit. It will be found that on this assumption the ten curtains joined together will exactly cover the whole length of the tabernacle, and hang down on either side to about the middle of the tabernacle walls. This result is a strong confirmation of the correctness of our assumption. The ten curtains were made up in two sets of five curtains. On the corresponding edges of each set there were made fifty loops of blue, and the loops were attached to one another by fifty clasps of gold, in this way uniting the whole. Now the width of each curtain is given as 4 small cubits, so that the ten curtains joined together would cover 40 small cubits in length, which is equivalent to 30 medium cubits. But some allowance must be made for the space occupied by the loops and clasps by which the two sets were joined together. If we allow half a medium cubit, just over 7 inches, for this, we find that the total length covered by the ten curtains so joined together is $30\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, which we have seen to be the exact internal measurement of the tabernacle. Once more the length of each curtain is given as 28 small cubits, or 21 medium cubits. The width of the tabernacle, including the thicknesses of the walls, is $10\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, so that there would be rather more than 5 medium cubits' length of curtain to hang down on either side. The height of the boards being 10 medium cubits, the curtains would thus reach to the middle of the boards. There is a verisimilitude about these results which is very convincing. Nothing is said as to the way in which this covering of the tabernacle was stretched over the tabernacle area. The curtains may have been attached to the bars of the tabernacle walls, or other ways may suggest themselves; but this no doubt Moses had seen in the mount.

When the camp was removed, the boards, bars, pillars, and sockets of the tabernacle, and all that belonged to them, were in the charge of the Merarites, while the tabernacle covering and screen were undertaken by the Gershonites. The veil of the sanctuary, as we have already noticed, was used to cover the ark, and was the responsibility of the Kohathites.

II. THE TENT.

Moses was commanded to make curtains of goats' hair, which was the ordinary material for the purpose, for a tent over the tabernacle. Eleven of these curtains were made, each being 30 cubits long and 4 cubits wide, which we must take to be medium cubits. The curtains were made up in two sets, of five and six curtains respectively, the set of six curtains being at the front or east end of the tent, and the other set at the back. On corresponding edges of these two sets there were made fifty loops of undefined material, and fifty brass clasps were made for uniting the loops. It is easy to reckon the length which would be covered by eleven curtains of these dimensions so joined together. Each curtain being 4 medium cubits wide, and, allowing half a cubit as before for loops and clasps, we get a total length of $44\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits. We have already shown above that the total length of the tabernacle and its entrance was $40\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, so that there is an excess of 4 cubits in the tent covering to be accounted for. The record tells us that half a curtain-width, that is 2 cubits, *hung over the back of the tabernacle*,¹ while the outmost curtain in the front set was *doubled over in the forefront of the tent*.² It is probable that the hanging over and doubling over are not to be distinguished, but refer to a doubling over so as to hang down at the front and back.

It must have been obvious to Moses and the men of his time, even if he had not seen a pattern of all, that the making of a tent implied the provision of both tent- and ridge-poles. This is no doubt the reason why these articles are not mentioned in the record. It is sufficient to say that the curtains were prepared to be spread tent-wise over the tabernacle. As regard the tent-poles, there must have been one at each of the two extremities of the tent. The eastern pole we take to have been in a line with the two pillars on which the screen was hung; the western pole must, we think, have stood immediately behind the tabernacle boards on that side. If this is so, then the total length of the tent must have been $40\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits (which was the internal measurement of the tabernacle and its entrance) plus the thickness of the western tabernacle wall, one handbreadth, and the thickness of both the tent-poles, say two handbreadths, which amounts to 41 medium cubits and one handbreadth in all. The total length of curtains and their attachment we saw to be $44\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, leaving an excess of

¹ Exod. xxvi. 12.² Verse 9.

3 cubits and one handbreadth. Of this excess 2 cubits we are told hung over the back of the tent, leaving only 1 cubit and a handbreadth to be doubled over in the front of the tent. This may account for the fact that while the amount to hang down at the back is specified as half a curtain-width, it is simply stated that the sixth curtain, that is to say, what was to spare of the sixth curtain, was to be doubled over in the front. We gain an impression of minute accuracy in the record. There must have been a third tent-pole to support these heavy curtains. Unless the covering of the tabernacle was pierced to admit its passage, of which there is no hint, this pole must have been situated at the junction of the two sets of curtains which formed that covering. This then we conclude to have been the case, and the third pole will then have been placed at a distance of 5×4 small cubits, or 15 medium cubits from the western wall of the tabernacle. The ridge-poles were probably two in number, one of which would require to be 15 medium cubits and the other 25 medium cubits in length, which is by no means impossible. As regards the height of the tent-poles, we take them to have been 15 medium cubits in height, both because the height of Solomon's Temple was 30 medium cubits,¹ and also because the assumption fits in with other known measurements.

It may be worthy of notice that the number of pillars in the tent and tabernacle will in this way amount to twelve; three poles for the tent, four pillars for the veil, and five for the entrance. We remember the twelve pillars near the altar when the covenant was made; and the grouping of three, four, and five respectively may also have some significance, but to the writer it does not seem probable that it is so.


The curtains were spread tent-wise over the ridge-pole, making a right angle at the apex. As each curtain was 30 medium cubits in length, there will have been about 15 cubits of length for either side, but 1 cubit of this hung down as a flap, so that the actual tent covering will have been 28 medium cubits in length, answering in cubit measurement, though not in actual length, to the 28 small cubits' length of the tabernacle covering.

The tent curtains were of course stretched with cords fastened to pegs. If the tent-poles were 15 medium cubits high, and the curtains formed a right angle at the apex, it will be seen that the two lines of pegs, which were of brass,² must

¹ 1 Kings vi. 2.

² Exod. xxxviii. 31.

have been 30 medium cubits apart. We may then conclude that the tent was spread in the following manner. The tent curtains, which were 30 medium cubits in length, might have been laid flat on the ground, and a tent-peg driven in at the junction of each two curtains. The curtains were then taken away, and the position of the tent-poles measured, and the ridge-poles mounted. The curtains were then placed upon these and fastened to the pegs already in position.



- a. Ridge-pole.
- b. Tent-pole at back of Tent.
- cccc. Pillars of the Veil.
- ddddd. Covering of the Tabernacle.
- ee. Half Curtain of Tent Covering at back of Tent.
- ff. Tabernacle Boards.
- gg. Rings for Bars.
- hh. Tent Covering.

SECTION OF TABERNACLE AND TENT THROUGH THE VEIL.

It will also be seen from the figure that the curtains of the tent just touched the top of the tabernacle walls; and that outside those walls a space of 5 medium cubits or 6 feet was under the tent covering. It was in this space, no doubt, that Aaron and his sons lodged when, at their consecration, for seven days they did not leave the court of the tabernacle. Here also probably *Eli was laid down in his place,*¹ and *Samuel was laid down to sleep, in the temple of Jehovah, where the ark of God was;* here too he could see that the lamp was still burn-


¹ 1 Sam. III, 2, 3.

ing in the holy place. This it was also which formed the precedent for the priests' chambers in the temple, *built against the wall of the house round about.*¹

We have seen that there were openings both in the tabernacle covering and in the tent covering, but these openings were not immediately above one another. The opening of the tabernacle covering was distant 15 medium cubits, and that of the tent covering 18 medium cubits from the western end of the tabernacle. It has already been noticed that *the clasps* under which the veil of the sanctuary was hung cannot refer to the clasps of either of these openings. The probability is that the four pillars of the veil were connected by cross bars, from which depended hooks and clasps from which the veil was hung. Similar cross bars, as already suggested, may have connected the pillars of the entrance. These bars, and the tent-pole which passed through the opening in the tabernacle covering, may all have been utilized for fastening that covering in position. The openings were no doubt for purposes of ventilation, since both incense fumes and the fumes from the seven lamps must somehow have found an exit above.

THE COVERINGS OF THE TENT.

Two outer coverings were prepared for the tent. These we believe were not ordinarily spread upon it, but only when the weather was threatening. The lower covering was of



GENERAL VIEW OF THE TENT OF MEETING.

rams' skins dyed red, and the outer covering was of sealskins, or porpoise skins. The prophet Ezekiel mentions the latter material as used for shoe soles.² The LXX translate the Hebrew *tachash* by *δέρματα ὑακίνθινα*, which suggests to us that the skins may have been dyed some shade of blue.

¹ 1 Kings vi. 5.

² Exod. xxvi, 14 and marg. ; Ezek. xvi, 10.

During removal the curtains of the tent and its two coverings were the responsibility of the Gershonites.

We have already suggested when discussing the laver that the space between the western side of the court and the back of the tabernacle measured 10 medium cubits in depth. We now realize that the width of the court being 50 large or $62\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, and the space occupied by the tent between its two rows of pegs being 30 medium cubits, there was a total space of $32\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits of width unoccupied. This gives rather more than 16 cubits of vacant space, or between 19 and 20 feet, on north and south.

THE FURNITURE OF THE TABERNACLE.

When the priests entered the tent they did so by the north or south side of the entrance, from which there was direct access into the Holy Place. On entering this, by the light from the entrance, the priest would see on his right hand the Table of Shewbread, and on his left hand the Golden Candlestick; while in front of him, on the further side of the central tent-pole, standing before and in the middle of the veil, he would see the Golden Altar of Incense. These three objects we must first describe, and then pass in thought within the veil, and see the Ark, the Mercy Seat, and the Cherubim.

THE TABLE OF SHEWBREAD.

This table was made of acacia wood, 2 cubits long, 1 cubit broad, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits high. Since these measurements are given in connection with the carpenter's work, we take the cubits to be medium cubits. The table was overlaid with pure gold, and a *crown* of gold ran round its top. The table stood on four legs, and the top projected one handbreadth over the legs, a second crown apparently running round the edge of the table. Just beneath the projecting edge of the table and upon its four legs golden rings were fastened to admit the staves by which it was carried. These staves were of acacia wood overlaid with gold. All the vessels for use at this table were made of pure gold, and comprised *dishes, spoons, flagons, and bowls wherewith to pour out*. The separate mention of these vessels raises an interesting question. The dishes were, no doubt, to hold the shewbread, and the spoons would be of use in placing frankincense upon the rows or piles of shewbread.¹ But the

¹ Lev. xxiv. 5-7.

mention of flagons and bowls has caused a difficulty. Dr. Edersheim¹ states that the unanimous testimony of tradition "is against any drink-offering having been brought into the holy place," and he himself accepts this view. He says further that considerable doubt exists as to the precise meaning of the terms used to describe the golden vessels of the table, and that "the Rabbis regard the Hebrew terms rendered 'covers' (A.V.) and 'bowls' as referring to hollow golden tubes which were placed between the shewbread (loaves), so as to allow the air to circulate between them". It is presumptuous to venture upon an opinion contrary to so great an authority as Dr. Edersheim, and it may seem difficult to go against the opinion of the Rabbis in a question of this kind, but it may be permitted to draw attention to the fact that both the LXX translators and our own Revisers have taken the Hebrew terms as referring to vessels for a drink-offering. It may also be apposite to notice that in the representation of the table of shewbread on the Arch of Titus flagons or urns are seen upon it. It is true that the words in dispute occur in Scripture only in connection with the Temple vessels, and that their derivation does not help to fix their meaning. Still we may, perhaps, be allowed to state our own belief that the Revisers have been right in translating the words *the flagons thereof and the bowls thereof wherewith to pour out*. An additional reason for taking them in this sense will appear when we consider what the shewbread really was. A comparison of the ritual for a meal-offering and that for the shewbread will make it plain that the two were identical in significance. The law for a meal-offering baked in the oven or pan² was that it should be made of fine flour, unleavened and mingled with oil. The priest was to take from it *the memorial thereof, and burn it upon the altar, an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto Jehovah*. The remainder was eaten by the priests. The law for the shewbread³ was to take fine flour and bake twelve cakes. Although it is not said that the flour was to be unleavened and mingled with oil, it is inconceivable that leavened cakes should be put upon *the pure table* in the very presence of Jehovah, and we may certainly assume that the oil was not absent. These twelve cakes were to be placed in two rows (or piles) upon the table. Upon each row or pile there was to be placed pure frankincense *that it may be to the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto Jehovah*. When

¹ "The Temple," p. 183.² Lev. II. 4-10.³ Ib. XXIV. 5-9.

the bread was taken away, the frankincense was burned upon the altar of incense as the memorial, and the bread was consumed by the priest. A comparison of these two laws seems to make it clear that the idea of the two kinds of offering is identical. It was a necessary part of the symbolism that no burnt-offering should be offered upon the altar of incense, and there was a strict injunction to this effect, including also its inseparable adjunct the meal-offering in the prohibition.¹ But if this was so, something else from the shewbread must be burned as its memorial if it was to fulfil the conception of a meal-offering. The frankincense was accordingly provided *that it might be to the bread for a memorial*. The parallelism is then complete, and indeed the understanding of this fact, as we believe it to be, is necessary for the true interpretation of the shewbread. But when this is once established, it seems at once to follow that there must have been also a drink-offering upon the table, because as we shall show later² every meal-offering was accompanied by a drink-offering. It is expressly stated indeed that no libation was to be poured out upon the altar of incense,³ but we believe that the wine was present upon the table, and that the burning of the frankincense took the place not only of the burning of one of the cakes, but also of the libation of the wine. Both bread and wine became, after the burning of the memorial, the due of the priests, which was the case with all meal- and drink-offerings which were not for himself, in which case they were wholly burnt or poured out. The fact that the presence of a drink-offering with the shewbread is rather implied (if it is implied) than stated will be no difficulty when we recollect that the law of the meal-offering is given⁴ without any mention of the drink-offering, though we gather from elsewhere that the two invariably went together. We have somewhat laboured this point because it seems to be of importance in the exposition.

As regards the term shewbread, it "is a translation of that used by Luther (*Schaubrod*), which, in turn, may have been taken from the Vulgate (*panes præpositionis*). The Scriptural name is *Bread of the Face*,⁵ that is of the presence of God, just as the similar expression *Angel of the Face*⁶ means *the Angel of His Presence*. From its constant presence and disposition in the sanctuary, it is also called *perpetual* (R.V.

¹ Exod. xxx. 9.⁴ Lev. II,² Chap. xvi.⁵ Exod. xxv. 30.³ Exod. xxx. 9.⁶ Is. lxiii. 9,

continual) bread¹ and *bread of laying out*² (set in order), which latter most nearly corresponds to the term used in the New Testament (*οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως*)."³

At the time of removal the priest spread a cloth of blue over the table, and put upon it the four kinds of vessels which have been described, leaving the bread in position, but perhaps dispensing with the wine, unless the flagons were closed with tight-fitting covers. Over the whole a cloth of scarlet was spread, and a covering of sealskin over that. Then with the insertion of the staves it was ready for the Kohathite Levites to transport.

THE CANDLESTICK.

The dimensions of the golden candlestick are not given, but we are told that a talent of pure gold⁴ was used in the construction of this lamp-stand and of its vessels. In Solomon's Temple ten golden candlesticks were made, but there also no hint is given of their size, so that we have no means of determining this question. We remember however that the height of the table was $1\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits, and that of the golden altar was 2 medium cubits, and we may feel sure that the candlestick was higher than these, so that its light might fall upon them. Moreover the candlestick being entirely of gold its measurement would be in small cubits. One and a half medium cubits is the same as 2 small cubits, while 2 medium cubits is less than 3 small cubits. We may then conclude that the candlestick was at least 3 small cubits in height.

The candlestick was made of *beaten or turned work*, which probably indicates that it was hollow. It consisted of a base and a shaft, and from this shaft there sprang three branches on either side. The ends of these six branches probably were in a horizontal line with the topmost extremity of the shaft, and with it formed receptacles for seven movable lamps. The shaft and the six branches were adorned with knobs (or buds) and flowers, in shape like almond blossoms. In the central shaft there were four of these, one at each of the three points where a pair of branches left the stem, and one at the extremity, which held the lamp. In each of the branches there were three of these adornments, two in the

¹ Num. iv. 7.

² 1 Chron. ix. 32.

³ Edersheim, "The Temple," p. 182.

⁴ Hence perhaps called *the pure candlestick*.

branch itself, and one at its extremity forming a lamp-holder as in the central shaft.

When the tabernacle was removed, the priests covered the candlestick, and its lamps, snuffers, snuff-dishes, and oil vessels with a cloth of blue, and a second covering of sealskin, and the whole was then placed upon a frame or a bar and given to the Kohathite Levites to carry.

The oil burned in these lamps was *pure olive oil beaten*.¹ The lamps were trimmed in the morning and lighted in the evening² by the priest. When it is said³ that the lamp was to *burn continually* it must be understood in the same sense in which the daily burnt-offering is called *a continual burnt-offering* and the daily incense *a perpetual incense*.⁴ It is clear that in the time of Eli the lamp did not burn all through the night.⁵

THE GOLDEN ALTAR.

This altar was a pedestal of acacia wood, the top and sides being overlaid with pure gold. Its dimensions were 1 medium cubit in length and breadth, and 2 in height. The wood was extended at each of the top corners in the shape of a horn, and these too were overlaid with gold. A *crown* (or *rim* or *moulding*) of gold ran round the top, and there were golden rings close under this; two rings (or a single ring) on each of two opposite sides, through which the staves for carrying it were passed. These staves, as in other cases, were of acacia wood overlaid with gold.

This pedestal was used as a receptacle for the lighted censer. The method of offering incense⁶ was for the priest to go with the censer in his hand to the altar of burnt-offering. There he filled his censer with fire taken by tongs from the altar, and holding the lighted censer in one hand, he entered the holy place. There he found a supply of incense,⁷ and taking some in his hand he *put the incense upon the fire before Jehovah*, at the same time placing the burning censer upon the golden altar. As regards the incense, its ingredients were three kinds of sweet spices, together with pure frankincense in equal proportions, seasoned with salt, a composition which might be used for no other purpose.⁸

The history of Zechariah makes it plain that the priest was alone while performing this service, and in this way we

¹ Exod. xxvii. 20.

² *Ib.* xxx. 7, 8.

³ *Ib.* xxvii. 20.


⁴ *Ib.* xxix. 42; xxx. 8.

⁵ 1 Sam. iii. 3.


⁶ See Lev. xvi. 12, 13; Num. xvi. 46; Is. vi. 6; Rev. viii. 5.

⁷ Exod. xxx. 36.

⁸ *Ib.* xxx. 34-38.




Elevation of Ark.



Plan of ark viewed from above.

aa. The mercy-seat.

Scale of Cubits



THE ARK (conjectural).

can understand that Nadab and Abihu were guilty of a double fault. In the first place they used strange fire, that is, other than the prescribed fire from the brazen altar; and in the second place they entered the sanctuary together, both which were contrary to the rule.

Incense was burned ceremonially upon this altar twice in the day, at the time of the dressing and of the lighting of the lamps.

There is an implied connection of the golden altar with the holiest place which is worthy of notice. Moses is directed to *put it before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony, before the mercy-seat that is over the testimony*; ¹ and in the Book of Kings it is described as *the altar that belonged to the oracle*; ² so that the writer to the Hebrews is only carrying out the spirit and purpose of the arrangement when he attaches this article of the tabernacle furniture to the Holy of Holies, ³ rather than to the Holy Place.

The priests covered this altar with a blue cloth and an outer covering of sealskins when it was to be removed, and putting in the staves, committed it to the Kohathites.

THE ARK.

The ark was a box of acacia wood without a lid. It was $2\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits in length and $1\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits in breadth and height. It was overlaid within and without with pure gold. A crown of gold ran round the top. Four feet are spoken of in connection with the ark. It does not seem impossible to suppose that the box rested upon four feet, which would raise it slightly from the ground. Or it may be rather that the construction was like the illustration which is here shown. The point is unimportant, except that our conception of where the rings for the staves were placed must depend upon its decision, for these were put *in the four feet thereof*. The staves were as usual of acacia wood overlaid with gold.

At the time when the ark was made it contained the two tables of testimony. These two stone tablets had been made by Moses at God's command, to replace the original two tablets which he had broken. They copied the originals in every respect, and upon them God wrote the Ten Commandments. Moses was further directed to make an ark or casket of acacia wood to contain these, probably of a size exactly large enough to hold the two. This wooden casket with its tables was now placed inside the Ark. ⁴

¹ Exod. xxx. 6.

² 1 Kings vi. 22.

³ Heb. ix. 3, 4: "The Holy of Holies having a golden altar of incense," etc.

⁴ Deut. x. 1-5.

THE MERCY-SEAT.

The lid or covering of the ark was a slab of pure gold, called in the Hebrew *Capporeth*, which is derived from the verb *Caphar*, to cover or shelter. But this verb in the Hebrew Scriptures is continually used in the sense of *covering by atonement*, and we must take the name *Capporeth* not simply as denoting the cover of the ark, but much more as the place of atonement. The Greek translators accordingly render the word by *ἱλαστήριον*, *the propitiatory*, or, as in our English version, *the mercy-seat*.

This slab was $2\frac{1}{2}$ cubits long and $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits broad, which we take to be small cubits, the slab being made of gold. The slab was then smaller than the top of the ark, which was $2\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ medium cubits in size.

THE CHERUBIM.¹

On the north and south ends of the mercy-seat and of one piece with it were two cherubim of gold. The workmanship of these was similar to that of the candlestick, beaten or turned, which probably indicates that the figures were hollow and not solid. The faces of these figures are said to have been towards one another and towards the mercy-seat; which implies that each figure had one face only, and if so, we may be quite sure that the faces were human. They also had wings, *spread out on high and covering the mercy-seat*, which we may also interpret with confidence as implying a single pair of wings in each figure. We thus arrive at the conception of a pair of winged human forms, fashioned in gold, at each end of the mercy-seat and of one piece with it, with uplifted wings overshadowing the sacred spot. The illustration is an attempt to realize this conception. The height of these figures is not given; they are drawn in the illustration with a height of 2 small cubits, the same height as the ark itself. The spread of each wing would thus be just about half this measurement, if the wings were to cover the mercy-seat and meet in the middle; and we find in the Temple of Solomon that the two great cherubim made of olive wood overlaid with gold were in the same proportions, each cherub being 10 medium cubits in height, and the spread of each wing 5 cubits.

We read in Lev. xvi. 2 that the Lord would *appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat*. We take this to mean that *the glory of Jehovah* would appear in the cloud² which rested upon the mercy-seat. We read further that *the cloud of Jehovah was upon the tabernacle by day, and there was fire therein by night, in the*

¹ See further Appendix A.² Exod. xvi. 10.

sight of all the house of Israel, throughout all their journeys.¹ Combining these statements we learn that the pillar of cloud rested upon the tabernacle, immediately over the ark and mercy-seat, both within and without the tent. Its appearance above the tent was like a cloud in the daytime and fiery bright at night. Within the holiest place the glory of Jehovah was wont to appear within the cloud, whether constantly present, or only manifested on special occasions, it is difficult to decide. This glory, though usually withdrawn from sight, at times appeared to all the people,² and in this way the promise was fulfilled: *In the tent of meeting I will meet with the children of Israel, and the tent shall be sanctified by My glory.*³ So when Moses went into the tent of meeting to speak with Him, then he heard the voice speaking unto him from above the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony, from between the two cherubim; and he spake unto Him.⁴ On this account no doubt it was that the holiest place afterwards gained the name of *the Oracle*.⁵

There is a special direction that the staves of the ark should not be taken from it;⁶ and the careful observance of this direction is noted.⁷ Even in the Temple of Solomon the staves remained in position.⁸ The reason for this may have been that the ark was the most sacred portion of the whole tabernacle, being the seat of the Divine manifestation, and therefore was protected from all unnecessary handling. At the same time it seems that in preparation for transport the staves must have been temporarily removed. We read that the priests took down the veil of the screen which ordinarily screened the ark from sight, and covered the ark with the veil; upon this was spread a sealskin cover, and outside all a cloth of blue, and *they shall put in the staves thereof*.⁹ We notice that in the case of the ark the sealskin cover was not outermost, but a covering *all of blue*, like the robe of the high priest.¹⁰

NOTE.

It may be mentioned that the term *the house of God* or of *Jehovah* is applied to the tabernacle in the following passages: Exod. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26; Deut. xxiii. 18; Josh. vi. 24; ix. 23; Judges xviii. 31; xix. 18; 1 Sam. i. 7, 24; iii. 15; 2 Sam. xii. 20; and cf. 2 Sam. vii. 1-13. It is called *the temple of Jehovah* in 1 Sam. i. 9 and iii. 3. The two phrases occur together in the following Psalms of David: v. 7; xxvii. 4; lxv. 4. The house of God is mentioned in Psalms xxvi. 8; lv. 14; lxix. 19; cxxii. 1, 9; and the temple in Psalms lxviii. 29 and cxxxviii. 2; all ascribed to David. The reference in Psalms xi. 4; xviii. 6; xxiii. 6; xxix. 9 and xxxvi. 8, all Davidic, may not be to the Tabernacle.

¹ Exod. xl. 38.² See further Appendix B.³ Exod. xxix. 43.⁴ Num. vii. 89.⁵ 1 Kings vi. 5.⁶ Exod. xxv. 15.⁷ *Ib.* xxxvii. 5 (contrast ver. 15); xl. 20.⁸ 1 Kings viii. 7, 8. The text of the parallel passage in Chronicles is incorrect; cf. LXX.⁹ Num. iv. 5, 6.¹⁰ Exod. xxviii. 31.

CHAPTER, VIII.

THE PRIESTHOOD.

IN the previous chapter we endeavoured to realize the actual form and arrangements of the tabernacle. In the present chapter we shall attempt to do the same for the ministers in the tabernacle; describing the persons who were chosen for this purpose, their ministerial vestments, and the rite by which they received their consecration to this service.¹

THE MINISTERS OF THE TABERNACLE.

It is clear from the directions recorded in the Book of Exodus that the service of God was regarded as conducted in two places, within the tent of meeting and at the brazen altar.² The service in these two places was the sole prerogative of the family of Aaron; indeed we may in a true sense say that it was the sole prerogative of Aaron himself, others being allowed to share in it only on account of their blood relationship to him. This fact is already apparent in the first command to Moses on this subject, *Bring thou near unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, that he (not they) may minister unto Me in the priest's office.*³ And when, immediately following this, the names of the persons are given, *even Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar*, the standing of the four as *Aaron's sons* is again referred to. It is clear that one person, Aaron, is the priest, and that his sons are admitted to priestly functions only *with him*, and on account of their blood relationship. It should also be noticed that Aaron is spoken of as the brother of Moses. We have already remarked that the relationship between the three men on the mount at Rephidim was probably significant of their being united in a representation of Christ. We may perhaps see here in the choice of the brother of Moses to be the minister of the Taber-

¹ Exod. xxviii.-xxx. ; xxxix.-xl. ; Lev. viii.

² See for example Exod. xxx. 19, 20.

³ *Ib.* xxviii. 1, and so in verse 4 ; but see also verse 41.

nacle an indication that the true Redeemer¹ and the true High Priest are one and the same. But however this may be, it is clear that in the tabernacle the ministers were the subjects of Divine selection, and that the traditions of family or tribal priesthood were set on one side.

The position of the Levites in the service of the sanctuary must be briefly referred to. In the original directions to Moses² no reference is made to the tribe of Levi. It was when Moses came down from the mountain at the end of the forty days that we first hear of the Levites taking any prominent position. Moses had broken up the riotous assembly of idolaters, but the lanes of the camp were still full of unsobered revellers. Against these Moses had received a charge, but ministers were needed to carry out the work of judgment. *Whoso is on Jehovah's side, he cried, unto me!*³ *And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him.* To them was given the awful charge, *Consecrate yourselves to-day to Jehovah, yea, every man against his son, and against his brother; that He may bestow upon you a blessing this day.* This charge the Levites accepted, and fearlessly fulfilled; upon which a blessing of Jehovah was assured to them, but the nature of the blessing was not immediately defined. The Levites' act of judgment became a first step in the restoration of Israel, after which followed the second stay of Moses in the mount, and later the construction of the tabernacle. After some months, and on the first day of the New Year, the tabernacle was erected.

On this occasion Moses continued to exercise priestly functions, no doubt because Aaron and his sons had not yet been consecrated to the service. Their designation as the future priests, however, sanctioned their taking part in the inaugural service.⁴ It was at this time that God gave to Moses those detailed instructions as to sacrificial worship, which are recorded in Lev. I.-VII., and which would be necessary before Aaron and his sons undertook the duties of their office. In this same month also took place the solemn consecration service of the appointed priests, and their first public ministration,⁵ after which Moses withdrew from all priestly functions. Very shortly after this occurred the irreverent acts,⁶ possibly owing to drunkenness, which caused the death of Nadab and Abihu, two of Aaron's sons; and the solemn lesson was drawn by Moses from the event, *This is it that Jehovah spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh Me, and*

¹ Ac. VII. 35, Gk,

⁴ *Ib.* XL,

² Exod. XXVIII.-XXIX,

⁵ Lev. VIII.-IX,

³ *Ib.* XXXII. 26.

⁶ *Ib.* X,

before all the people I will be glorified. It was now the first day of the second month, and the time for making known the special privilege of Levi had arrived.¹ The people were numbered by their tribes, but the Levites were excluded from this numbering and granted a special position. *Appoint thou the Levites over the tabernacle of the testimony, and over all the furniture thereof, and over all that belongeth to it; they shall bear the tabernacle, and all the furniture thereof; and they shall minister unto it, and shall encamp round about the tabernacle.* Accordingly we find the Levites encamped in close proximity to the tabernacle court on its four sides, a position of special privilege, as Moses himself expressed it to the discontented family of Korah. *Seemeth it but a small thing unto you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel to bring you near to Himself, to do the service of the tabernacle of Jehovah, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them.*² To this ministry the Levites, having been numbered for the purpose in a special manner, were set apart by a solemn act of consecration,³ their duty and function being that of assistants to the priests,⁴ so much so that they are even spoken of as making atonement for the children of Israel.⁵ But it is clear from the context that they did so simply as enabling the service of the sanctuary to be maintained. The essential distinction between the functions of Levite and of priest is not only insisted upon at the time of their institution, but is also strongly emphasized in the history of Korah, who *desired the priesthood also*; a history whose memorial long remained in the brazen plates of the altar, and the rod laid up in the sanctuary.⁶

THE VESTMENTS OF THE PRIESTS.⁷

We have already seen that in the Divine idea there is only one priest of the Sanctuary, and that all others who perform priestly functions do so by virtue of their connection with him. The same idea is illustrated in the priestly vestments, one person only wearing the full insignia of the priesthood. These vestments we shall describe in the order in which they were put on.

I. *The Breeches.*

These were short breeches of white linen, reaching certainly not further, if so far as to the knees. The legs and feet were bare.

¹ Num. i. 2.

² Ib. xvi. 9.

³ Ib. viii. 5-19.

⁴ Ib. iii. 5, 6, 9.

⁵ Ib. viii. 19.

⁶ Ib. xvi. and xvii.

⁷ Exod. xxviii., xxxix.

2. *The Coat.*

This was probably a short loose tunic, made of white linen and woven in checker pattern.

3. *The Girdle.*

The girdle was of fine twined linen, embroidered with the three colours of the sanctuary, blue and purple and scarlet. This girdle confined the loose tunic.

4. *The Robe of the Ephod.*

The robe of the ephod was a sleeveless garment woven entirely of blue thread, and probably without seam. There was a binding round the hole where it was put on over the head. This garment reached almost to the feet, and round the skirts at the bottom were arranged alternately balls of the three colours, in the form of pomegranates, and golden bells. *It shall be upon Aaron to minister ; and the sound thereof shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place before Jehovah, and when he cometh out, that he die not.*

5. *The Ephod.*

This is the central priestly vestment, the others being related to it ; as for example the robe which has just been described is the robe of the ephod ; the band to be spoken of below is the band of the ephod and joined to it ; and the breastplate is to be fastened so that it shall not leave the ephod. This vestment then deserves special consideration. We take it to have been in the form of two pieces, connected by two shoulder straps, put on in such a way that one piece hung down in front and the other piece at the back of the wearer, and tied round the breast with a band. All these pieces were made of the same materials and workmanship, namely, white twined linen with embroidery of gold and the three colours. It will be remembered that this is identical with the materials and workmanship of the veil and curtains of the tabernacle.

It will be worth our while here to recall what is told us in Scripture on the subject of the ephod, so that we may gain a distinct conception of the place which this vestment took in the history of the priesthood.

The name *ephod* is a transliteration of the Hebrew word, which is derived from a verb denoting *to bind* or *gird*, so that we read more frequently of being girded with the ephod than of wearing it.

In the Books of Moses the word is used only of Aaron's

vestment. In the Book of Judges, however, it is recorded that Gideon made an ephod of the golden ear-rings of the Midianites, and *put it in his city, and all Israel played the harlot after it there.*¹ Micah also, who had a house of gods, *made an ephod, and teraphim, and consecrated one of his sons, who became his priest.*² Afterwards a Levite became his priest, perhaps displacing his son, and once and again mention is made of the idols of Micah and his ephod and teraphim.³ It has been thought that the word ephod in these places denotes a kind of image, and the words of Hosea have been quoted in illustration, where he foretells that *the children of Israel shall abide many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice, and without pillar, and without ephod or teraphim.*⁴ But it is difficult to understand how a term which originally denoted a vestment girded upon the body could be transferred to an image; and the supposition seems unnecessary. May it not be that the ephod and teraphim which Micah made were in imitation of the ephod and Urim of the high priest, teraphim we know being used like the Urim in connection with divination?⁵ It is significant that he had already his house of idols, and that the making of the ephod and teraphim was in connection with the consecration of one of his sons to be their priest. It accords with this supposition that when the Levite told the men of Dan his story, and that he had become the priest of Micah, they at once desired him to *ask counsel of God*,⁶ and when he accompanied them to be their priest, he carried with him both ephod and teraphim and graven image, the latter to be the object of worship, as it is expressly stated below,⁷ and the two former as the essential part of his priestly vestment. The words of Hosea will then suggest to us that Micah and the Danites were not alone in this practice, but that the children of Israel in their pillar-worship were accustomed to imitate the ritual of the central sanctuary, and to invest their priests with ephod and with teraphim. If this be so indeed, then the ephod of Gideon may after all have been a vestment like that of the high priest, the rich gold embroidery of which was well known. It is not easy to see what induced Gideon to use the Midianite gold in this manner, much less to put it in his own city, and not to present it to the sanctuary. But the practical effect of it was that *all Israel played the harlot after it there.*

¹ Judges VIII. 27.² *Ib.* XVII. 5.³ *Ib.* XVIII. 14, 17, 18, 20.⁴ Hos. III. 4.⁵ Ezek. XXI. 21; Zech. x. 2.⁶ Judges XVIII. 4, 5.⁷ *Ib.* XVIII. 20, 30.

Was it the case that the imitation went so far as to include teraphim as well as gold-embroidered ephod, so that the people went there instead of to the tabernacle to ask counsel of God? and that the house of Gideon not only connived at, but forwarded the sinful practice, for purposes of private advantage? Scripture does not enable us to give a definite answer to these questions, so that they must remain uncertain.

Passing now to the Books of Samuel we find frequent mention of ephods. On the occasion when Jonathan and his armour-bearer attacked the Philistine garrison, we read that Saul summoned the priest Ahijah, to ask counsel of God. According to our present Hebrew text the passage reads, *And Saul said unto Ahijah, Bring hither the ark of God. For the ark of God was at that time with (Heb. and) the children of Israel.*¹ But this text is almost certainly corrupt, and some editions of the Septuagint appear to give the true sense, which read, *And Saul said unto Ahijah, Bring hither the ephod. For he wore the ephod at that time before Israel.* This then is a clear reference to the high priest's ephod, containing the Urim and Thummim, in the time of Saul. Once more when Ahimelech the priest received David in his flight, he speaks of the sword of Goliath as *wrapped in a cloth behind the ephod.*² The reference here again is undoubtedly to the ephod of the high priest, which was at that time in the sanctuary at Nob. But earlier than this we read of Samuel *ministering before Jehovah, being a child, girded with a linen ephod.*³ And again we hear that Doeg slew in the priestly city of Nob *fourscore and five persons that did wear a linen ephod.*⁴ These two notices show that in the time of Eli and Samuel others than the high priest were accustomed to wear ephods. But the ephod of the ordinary priest, though as we may believe of the same shape as that of the high priest, is distinguished from it as a *linen ephod*, indicating probably that it was of pure white linen, and destitute of embroidery. Samuel, as given to the Lord, seems to have been adopted by Eli, and although a child to have shared in the ministerial functions of the priests, so that he too was girded with a linen ephod. The immediate context of this statement mentions further that his mother made him a little *robe*, which she brought to him year by year;⁵ but this is not to be taken in connection with the preceding remark, as if the robe also were a ministerial vestment. The word in the original is indeed identical with

¹ 1 Sam. xiv. 18.

⁴ *Ib.* xxii. 18.

² *Ib.* xxi. 9.

⁵ *Ib.* ii. 18, 19.

³ *Ib.* ii. 18.

that used for the *robe of the ephod* of the high priest, but the same word is used elsewhere for any long garment;¹ and there is no hint that Samuel's dress was an imitation of that of Eli. But it is clear that at that time all the priests wore a white linen ephod. There are indeed two passages in this book where the phrase *to wear an ephod* seems a synonym for exercising the function of the priesthood.² The account of the escape of Abiathar to David is full of interest in this connection. We are told that David was at Keilah when found by Abiathar, and that *he came down with an ephod in his hand*.³ The expression *an ephod* and not *the ephod* suggests that this was not the high priest's ephod, but one of the ordinary ephods of the priests. In fact we have clear testimony that the Urim, and therefore we may conclude the high priest's ephod also, was at this time in the possession of Saul.⁴ Now we have seen that Abiathar did not reach David until he had entered into Keilah; while before he undertook that expedition David had twice asked counsel of God and received an answer. Scripture is silent as to the method which David employed on those two occasions, and it would be idle to imagine. But after Abiathar had joined him we find that he at once employed the mediation of the priest in enquiring of God, and that the priest when acting in this capacity was vested in the ephod;⁵ and indeed that this was the regular practice.⁶ It is true that Abiathar's ephod was destitute of the Urim and Thummim, so that we are still ignorant of the method in which the answer was received. But we know that Saul had been cast off by God, and had slain the priests of the Lord, so that though possessed of the high-priestly vestment and the Urim, no answer was vouchsafed to him. David, on the other hand, was the chosen of Jehovah, and reverentially using the mediation of the appointed priest of the Lord, even though the priest's external equipment was incomplete, he still obtained a gracious hearing and reply. There remains one other reference to the ephod in these books which must be noticed. On the occasion of the ark being brought up to Zion we are told⁷ that *David danced before Jehovah with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod*. The account in Chronicles is more precise. David himself, and all the Levite bearers of the ark, and the singers, and the

¹ E.g. Job i. 20; ii. 12; i Sam. xviii. 4; xxiv. 4; 2 Sam. xiii. 18; Ezra

ix. 3.

² i Sam. ii. 28; xiv. 3.

³ *Ib.* xxiii. 6.

⁴ *Ib.* xxviii. 6.

⁵ *Ib.* xxiii. 9.

⁶ *Ib.* xxx. 7.

⁷ 2 Sam. vi. 14.

choirmaster, were alike clothed with robes of fine linen, while David had in addition upon him an ephod of linen.¹ It is clear that David by this act took his place as a priestly minister of Jehovah. If we remember that the nation had been designated a kingdom of priests and a holy nation, and that David was the chosen of the Lord to be their king, and that at that moment he was engaged at the head of the whole nation in conducting the ark of Jehovah to the royal city, we can understand the feelings which prompted his action. Jehovah was the true king of the nation, and if the priests were designated as the servants of Jehovah in His sanctuary, an office which David never attempted to usurp, David was also the designated servant of Jehovah in the nation, and would therefore show himself as Jehovah's servant among his people. *It was before Jehovah*, and was no doubt accepted on account of the spirit in which it was offered, and the entirely exceptional character of the occasion.

On a review of the above notices we conclude that the ephod was originally the vestment of the high priest, but that in later times a copy of it, though of different materials, was worn by all the priests. There is indeed no record that this was done by Divine direction, but neither is there any prohibition of the custom, which we may suppose to have been gradually introduced. It was most prevalent in the time of Samuel; and we do not meet with any mention of ephods after the time of David.

We return now to the consideration of the ephod of the high priest. Mention has been made of the two shoulder-straps which connected the two portions of the ephod. On each of these straps were three objects which must be described. The first was an onyx stone enclosed in a gold setting, and placed on the highest part of the shoulder midway between the front and back. Upon this onyx stone were engraved, like the engravings of a signet, six names of the tribes of Israel, so that the high priest bore on his two shoulders the names of the twelve tribes. It is probable that the first letter only of the names was engraved, so that each stone would carry six letters, the names being in order of their birth. These were to be *stones of memorial for the children of Israel*, so that Aaron should *bear their names before Jehovah upon his two shoulders for a memorial*. Besides the onyx stone in its gold setting, each shoulder-strap had in the front, and as we may

¹ 1 Chron. xv. 27, 28.

suppose just below the onyx stone, another gold setting, from which depended a golden chain. Below this again and close to its junction with the front piece of the ephod there was a gold ring. The use of these will be clear when we describe the breastplate.

6. *The Band of the Ephod.*

The band of the ephod was a part of the ephod itself ; it is given special mention here only for greater clearness. It was of exactly the same materials and workmanship as the ephod and its shoulder-pieces ; and fastened upon the front piece of the ephod, in a position where it would lie across the breast ; while its two ends were tied behind, so as to hold the front and back portions of the ephod to the high priest's body.

7. *The Breastplate.*

The breastplate was also, like the ephod and its band, the work of the skilful workman ; and made double like a bag, to be the receptacle for the Urim and the Thummim. It was square, measuring a span, or small cubit, each way. The front of the breastplate was adorned with four rows of precious stones, set in golden settings, three stones being in each row. Upon the stones were engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel.

It has been remarked that on the shoulder-pieces of the ephod there were provided two golden settings with chains depending from them. These chains were passed through two golden rings at the upper extremities of the breastplate, and their ends fastened again in the settings.¹ In this way the breastplate hung so as to lie upon the band of the ephod. At the two bottom extremities of the breastplate and on its inner side were two other gold rings, through which was passed a lace of blue binding the breastplate to the gold rings which we have described as having been made at the bottom of the shoulder-pieces of the ephod.

Into the bag of this breastplate Moses was directed to *put the Urim and the Thummim.*² The words denote *the Lights and the Perfections* ; and it is clear that some object or objects are intended, but in the silence of Scripture it is useless to conjecture what they were. We only know that they were used by the priest in enquiring of God,³ and that, while they were in existence in the time of Saul,⁴ they had been lost by

¹ So we understand on a comparison of Exod. xxviii. 14, 23-25 with xxxix. 15-18.

² *Ib.* xxviii. 30.

³ Num. xxvii. 21.

⁴ 1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

the time of the return from the Babylonian captivity.¹ From the presence of the Urim and Thummim within it the breastplate obtained the name of *the breastplate of judgment*.

In this way Aaron was to *bear the names of the children of Israel upon his heart for a memorial before Jehovah continually*, and also to *bear the judgment of Israel upon his heart before Jehovah continually*.

8. *The Mitre.*

The mitre of the high priest was made of fine linen, but its shape is not described.

9. *The Golden Plate or Holy Crown.*

The Holy Crown² was a plate of pure gold, which was fastened by a lace of blue in front of the mitre and engraved with the words HOLY TO JEHOVAH.

These then were the ministerial garments of Aaron and of his successors in the office of priesthood.³ To the man upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and who was consecrated to put on these garments, the Lord Himself gave the name of *the great or high priest*.⁴ This title occurs in the books of Moses only in this place, and in the law regarding the cities of refuge for manslayers, where it is said that the manslayer should remain in the city of refuge until *the death of the high priest who was anointed with the holy oil*.⁵ The distinguishing name for Aaron and his successors is more commonly *the anointed priest*,⁶ alluding to the fact that on his head alone the anointing oil was poured. Excluding one reference in Joshua,⁷ which is a quotation from the Mosaic law, we do not find the title high priest in use until the time of the later kings, such as Jehoash,⁸ Josiah,⁹ and after the captivity in the prophets Haggai¹⁰ and Zechariah,¹¹ as well as in the Book of Nehemiah.¹² A somewhat similar title, *the head or chief priest*, is given to Aaron in the Book of Ezra,¹³ and occurs also though rarely in the Books of Kings and Chronicles and a parallel passage in Jeremiah.¹⁴

These facts confirm the impression that in the Divine idea

¹ Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65.

² Exod. XXXIX. 30; Lev. VIII. 9. On the word "crown," which has here no regal significance, but denotes a symbol of *separation to Jehovah*, see chapter XVII. p. 338.

³ Exod. XXIX. 29, 30; Num. XX. 25-28.

⁵ Num. XXXV. 25.

⁶ Lev. IV. 3.

⁴ Lev. XXI. 10.

⁸ 2 Kings XII. 10.

⁹ *Ib.* XXII. and XXIII.

⁷ Josh. XX. 6.

¹¹ Zech. III. 1 al.

¹² Neh. III. 20.

¹⁰ Hag. I. 1 al.

¹³ Ezra VII. 5.

¹⁴ 2 Kings XXV. 18; 2 Chron. XIX. 11; XXXI. 10; Jer. LII. 24.

one person only was the priest in the tabernacle and at the altar. It is the picture of Aaron alone which we must keep before us as answering to the great archetype.

The sons of Aaron were clothed in linen breeches and linen coats of checker work bound with embroidered girdles, differing in no way from those of Aaron. They had also head-tires of white linen, but probably of a different shape from the mitre of Aaron, as a different word is used to describe them. This completed their attire.

THE CONSECRATION OF THE PRIESTS.

During the first stay of Moses upon the mount he received full directions for the consecration of the priests.¹ The carrying out of these directions was, however, delayed until the tabernacle had been completed, and the ritual directions for offerings received; and when the time for doing so at last arrived, it was made known to Moses by a special oracle.² It seems clear that the service of consecration, which occupied seven whole days, took place in the first month of the second year after the Exodus. This service we shall now endeavour to describe.

The rite of consecration was administered by Moses, who up to this time had exercised priestly functions. In preparation for the rite Aaron and his sons were brought to the northern entrance of the court, and one young bullock and two rams, together with a basket containing unleavened bread and unleavened cakes and wafers mingled or anointed with oil, were provided. The service then proceeded as follows in the presence of the assembled congregation.

1. Aaron and his sons were first ceremonially washed with water by Moses, not at the laver, but near the entrance to the court.

2. Aaron was then vested in order with the garments of his office. The coat was put upon him and girded with its girdle; next came the robe of the ephod, and then the ephod itself, bound to his body by its band. After this the breastplate was fastened in position, and the Urim and Thummim placed in it. Finally the mitre was placed on his head, and the golden plate fastened in its forefront. When the investment of Aaron with his robes was completed, Moses took the anointing oil, and after anointing both tabernacle and altar,³ he poured the oil plentifully upon the head of Aaron, so plentifully that it ran down upon his beard and to

¹ Exod. xxix.

² Lev. viii. 1.

³ *Ib.* viii. 10-12.

the skirts of his garments.¹ Aaron's sons were then brought near and arrayed in their coats and bound with their girdles; but no anointing oil was poured upon their heads.

3. The next act was the offering of the bullock in sacrifice. This sacrifice is described as being a *sin-offering*,² a phrase which occurs here for the first time in Scripture, and upon which a few words must be said, even though we anticipate what will be more fully entered into later. Scripture makes it abundantly clear that since the time when our first parents sinned, access to God by men had been sought through the rite of animal sacrifice; and the connection seems clear between the death of the animals offered in sacrifice and the sentence of death pronounced against mankind. But at the same time Scripture is silent as to any prescribed ritual use of the blood thus constantly poured out in sacrifice. The primitive ritual seems to have emphasized the burning of the victim upon an altar, so that it might *ascend* in smoke and vapour; an idea which gave its name to the offering, as '*Olah*,³ which may best be rendered *an ascending offering*. Afterwards we find that while a part of the offering was still made to ascend upon the altar, part was retained and consumed by the worshipper, symbolizing apparently a condition of fellowship between him and the object of his worship. An offering of this kind is termed *Zevach*,⁴ which is derived from a verb meaning *to slay for food*. In the chapter which we are considering offerings of this kind are, for the first time in Scripture, designated *Shelamim*, *peace-offerings*.⁵ Both these forms of sacrifice were now to be taken up into the Mosaic system, and to them was to be added a third, to which is here given the name of Sin itself, *Chattath*,⁶ sin, a sin-offering. Bearing this in mind we pay special attention to the ritual prescribed in the offering of this bullock. We find that before the Tent of Meeting, that is just within the northern entrance of the court, and at not many yards' distance from the tabernacle, Aaron and his sons were to lay their hands upon the head of the bullock. Moses was then to kill it at the same spot. He was to take the blood to the altar, and put some of it with his finger upon the horns of the altar, and to pour out all the remainder at its base. All the fat of the animal was to be burned⁷ upon the

¹ Ps. cxxxiii. 2.

² Exod. xxix: 14.

³ A.V. *Burnt-offering*, first in Gen. viii. 20.

⁴ A.V. *Sacrifice*, first in Gen. xxxi. 54.

⁵ Exod. xxix. 28.

⁶ First in Gen. iv. 7.

⁷ As a burnt-offering is turned into smoke or vapour. Heb. For the burning by fire outside the camp another word is used.

altar, while every other part was to be consumed by fire outside the camp. These points afterwards formed distinguishing features of the ritual for sin-offerings, as we shall see later.

4. After the offering of the bullock one of the rams was sacrificed. This is designated as *a burnt-offering unto Jehovah*, and as *a sweet savour, an offering-made-by-fire unto Jehovah*. The ritual prescribed is as follows. Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. Moses killed it, and taking the blood sprinkled it round about the altar. He then cut the ram into pieces, and after washing it with water turned the whole into smoke and vapour upon the altar. These points of ritual also became the precedent for this special form of offering.

5. There remained the second ram, which was offered in the following manner. Aaron and his sons first laid their hands upon its head, and Moses then killed the ram, as in the two former offerings. But in this case the blood was applied in three ways. Part of it was put upon the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot of Aaron and of his sons. A second part was sprinkled round about the altar. A third part was taken from the altar—where we may imagine a bowl to have stood during the sprinkling round the altar—and after being mixed with the anointing oil it was sprinkled upon the persons and upon the garments of Aaron and of his sons. Moses now took all the fat of the ram, and the right thigh, and one from each of the three kinds of unleavened cakes in the basket, and put the whole in the hands of Aaron and his sons, and in this way waved them as a wave-offering before Jehovah.

This act of Moses was a sign that Aaron and his sons were thereby endued with authority to exercise priestly functions; in the Hebrew phrase he *filled their hands*,¹ so that this ram is termed *Aaron's ram of consecration* or *filling*; or, as the Greek translators render it, *this is a perfecting*.² Moses next took these things back from their hands, and burned them on the altar, upon the burnt-offering which was already there, as a sweet savour before Jehovah and a fire-offering made to Him.

As regards the remainder of the ram, the breast was taken by Moses as his portion, after he had waved it; while the rest was boiled and eaten, together with the remainder of the cakes, by Aaron and his sons. This was done near the

¹ Exod. xxviii. 41, marg.

² τελέωσις. Ib. xxix. 22.

northern entrance of the court *in a holy place*, which we take to mean in that portion of the court which was between this entrance and the tabernacle. If any of the flesh or of the bread was not eaten on the same day it was to be consumed with fire.

Certain portions of this ritual, as for example the laying on of hands, the slaying of the ram, the sprinkling of blood round about the altar, the waving or heaving, the burning of the fat as a sweet savour upon the altar, the three-fold partition of the flesh between the altar, the priest, and the offerer ; all these afterwards became part of the ritual for peace-offerings. Other portions of the ritual, as the putting of the blood upon parts of the body, the sprinkling of persons and garments with blood and oil, the placing of the fat and cakes in the hands of Aaron and his sons while Moses waved them, were all peculiar to this occasion. The treatment of the breast and right thigh (or shoulder) of the victim was also special, though it was to form a precedent for the future ritual of peace-offerings. In future the breast and thigh were to be the priests' portion out of all the peace-offerings of Israel, the thigh being the portion of the individual officiating priest, and the breast that of the priestly body. In the present case Moses stands as the representative of the priestly body before the institution of Aaron, and so receives the breast as his portion. The waving and the heaving which was afterwards to be the duty of the officiating priest is here taken part in by Aaron and his sons, as a token that they were then admitted to the office of the priesthood. But as they were also on this occasion the offerers, having laid their hands upon the head of the ram, the portion of the officiating priest¹ was not given to them but remained as it were with God, and was burned with the Lord's portion upon the altar.

6. The rites which have been described were to be repeated daily for seven days, during which time Aaron and his sons did not leave the court of the tabernacle. On the completion of these ceremonies they were regarded as perfected for the fulfilment of their ministry in the tabernacle.

We read in the eighth and ninth chapters of Leviticus how these directions were carried out, and how at length on the eighth day Aaron entered upon the duties of his office. *And Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people and blessed them ; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-*

¹ This comprised one of each kind of the cakes as well as the thigh. All these were accordingly burnt on the altar on this occasion along with the thigh,

offering, and the peace-offerings. And Moses and Aaron went into the tent of meeting, and came out and blessed the people ; and the glory of Jehovah appeared unto all the people. And there came forth fire from before Jehovah, and consumed (Heb. ate up, as taking to Himself) upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat ; and when all the people saw it, they shouted and fell on their faces. In this way the ministry in the tabernacle was inaugurated and received the Divine acknowledgment.

CHAPTER IX.

TABERNACLE, ALTAR, AND PRIEST LIKE CHRIST.

WE have devoted two whole chapters to an investigation and description of the Tabernacle and its Ministry with a double purpose. In the first place it is hoped that our impression of what has been called the "fact-quality" of the narrative will have been deepened. It is of no small importance to realize the historical character of the things which we are considering. In our age at least a picture drawn by mere fancy or imagination cannot long engage our attention, much less satisfy heart and mind. It will not then have been in vain to show, as we think that we have shown by very many minute coincidences, that the tabernacle and its ministry are a settled fact of history, and that their existence must therefore be accounted for on some reasonable theory. But any theory which claims to provide the explanation of these elaborate arrangements must be based upon a comprehensive view of the arrangements themselves. And this is the second object which we have had in view in seeking to realize distinctly the whole system before attempting any theory in explanation. But now, having performed this task, we can with confidence address ourselves to the happy theme of this chapter ; and show how both tabernacle and ministry alike find an adequate and complete explanation in the theory that they were made like the Son of God. We make no excuse for at once introducing this as the true and sufficient reason for the whole ; for up to this point in the history we have seen that this has been the ruling principle in all the dealings of God with Israel ; so much so indeed that the introduction of any other principle here would have to be specially accounted for. But there is no necessity for any further search, we have already in our hands a key which will open every ward of this complicated lock ; and a reason which by its intrinsic wonder and majesty will fully account for this remarkable interference of God, if we may so term it, to regulate the details of ritual worship of Himself,

THE NAMES OF THE TABERNACLE.

The Hebrew word for tabernacle is *Mishkan*, which means *a dwelling*, in strict accordance with the purpose expressed by God to Moses, *Let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them.*¹ It was indeed to be the embodiment and medium of that Presence of God which had been promised to the Israelites, and which they had so nearly lost, but which had been won back for them by the prayers and mediation of Moses. And here we come at once to a likeness to the Son of God. He became incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary that the promise of Emmanuel might be fulfilled.² At the time when God made a dwelling amongst the pilgrim people He made it in outward form like their dwellings, and pitched a tent among their tents. The apostle is undoubtedly referring to this as an essential likeness to the Son of God, when He speaks of the Eternal Word becoming flesh and dwelling as in a tent³ among us. Our Lord Himself set His seal upon this interpretation when He spoke of His own Body as being the sanctuary, *Destroy this temple,*⁴ *and in three days I will raise it up.*

We cannot then be mistaken in believing that the details of construction of the tabernacle were directed by God with a view to illustrating the essential facts of the incarnation of His Son. But before we proceed to examine particulars in the light of this principle, we are struck by one general feature in the likeness. The outward appearance of the tent was more like than unlike the myriad other tents which surrounded it. On every side of the place where God dwelt under curtains of goats' hair were similar Israelite dwellings, large and small, some also it may be with bright extra coverings or adornments. Externally there was more likeness than difference; but within there was more difference than likeness. Within all was rich and pure and sacred, how different from the interior of any of those countless other tents pitched all around it! We feel the appropriateness of this arrangement to be a picture of Him whose sacred form had no comeliness more than other men;⁵ Who came in the very likeness and form of men;⁶ Who was *sent in the likeness of sinful flesh,*⁷ but in Whom there dwelt not only absolute purity but also the very form of God.

But the tabernacle was not merely the dwelling of God, the

¹ Exod. xxv. 8, 9.

² Is. vii. 14; Matt. i. 22, 23.

³ John i. 14, ἐσκήνωσεν.

⁴ Ib. ii. 19, τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον.

⁵ Is. liii. 2.

⁶ Phil. ii. 7, 8.

⁷ Rom. viii. 3.

whole place was also called *the Tent of Meeting*,¹ for the express reason that in this place Jehovah would *meet with the children of Israel*.² The separation of man from God and of God from man had been constantly emphasized as the result of man's sin from the record of the Fall down to the times of which we are speaking. This gulf was now to be bridged, and this separation turned into a happy meeting within the tabernacle; and this surely just because man is brought near to God in no other way than through His incarnate Son. *No one cometh unto the Father but by Me*³ that Son Himself testified. And His chosen Apostle tells us how *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself*.⁴

Once more the tabernacle is frequently called *the Tabernacle of the Testimony*.⁵ This name was given to it because it enshrined *the ark of the testimony*, which again was so called because it contained *the tables of the testimony*. These last were the stone tablets on which were inscribed the Ten Words, God's testimony to His own claims and against the sins of men. The testimony of these Words of God was still further reinforced by the rules of the tabernacle itself. Not only was general entry forbidden to men, but the most sacred place was fenced by a veil, beyond which only the high priest was allowed to pass, and he only once a year not without blood of expiation. All this was a constant testimony⁶ to the holiness of God, and to the essential sinfulness of fallen man. While it invited the repentant to meet with God, it repelled the careless; a standing witness alike to the justice and to the love of God. How like is this to the effect of the appearance of the Son of God in the days of His flesh. *The world hateth Me, because I testify of it that its works are evil*.⁷ *This is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their works were evil*.⁸ Or again, *To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth*,⁹ and so become the true tabernacle of the testimony, *the faithful witness*.¹⁰

THE TABERNACLE.

We have seen some ways in which the intended incarnation of the Son of God governed the general form and uses of the tabernacle with its covering tent; and we may expect

¹ A.V., inadequately, "the tabernacle of the congregation".

² Exod. xxix. 42, 43.

⁵ Exod. xxxviii. 21.

⁸ *Ib.* iii. 19.

³ John xiv. 6.

⁶ Heb. ix. 8.

⁹ *Ib.* xviii. 37.

⁴ 2 Cor. v. 19.

⁷ John vii. 7.

¹⁰ Rev. i. 5.

that the necessity of preserving this correspondence will also be found to govern the details of its structure. This expectation will not be disappointed. For example, we find at once that the tabernacle consisted of two parts, the Holy Place and the Most Holy, and moreover that the whole tent was sanctified by the presence of the glory of Jehovah in the innermost sanctuary.¹ We can scarcely fail to see then in the Most Holy place a designed likeness to the essential Deity of the Incarnate Son. If His Body was like the bodies of other men, it, unlike all others, enshrined the glory of Jehovah. Nor is the general truth that the Son of Man in the days of His flesh was also truly God the only truth which is here embodied in symbols. We have to take note also of the furniture of the Holiest Place, which eloquently bears witness to the fact that the Incarnate Son was not only the possessor of full Deity, but that He also wielded Divine prerogatives. We find three things within this shrine: (1) the Ark, enclosing the tables of the law; (2) the Mercy-seat; (3) the Glory enthroned upon the cherubim. These will most fitly symbolize the Divine prerogatives of judgment, of forgiveness, and of rule over created things. Most certainly are we taught by St. James that lawgiver and judge are one,² even God; but with what fulness of Divine authority the Incarnate Son promulgates the laws of the Kingdom of God,³ and claims the dispensation of judgment!⁴ Most truly also did the Jews premise that none could forgive sins but God only.⁵ But yet what convincing proof our Lord offered to them that the Son of Man had power on earth to forgive sins; and how frequently He exercised His prerogative of mercy, *Thy sins be forgiven thee, go into peace*. And once more what manner of man was this Jesus of Nazareth whom winds and waves obeyed? And not only the winds and waves, but every created thing bowed to His will and was plastic to His touch. Alike in the moral, the spiritual, and the physical worlds our Lord claimed prerogatives and exercised powers wholly Divine.

One detail of construction in the Holiest Place, a detail which is somewhat emphasized in the record, must not pass without notice. At first sight it may seem incongruous that figures of human form should have been introduced into that place where all else spoke of the Divine presence and action. But we notice that they are introduced in connection with the propitiatory, and in fact are made of one piece with it. We

¹ Exod. xxix. 43.

⁴ John v. 22, 23.

² James iv. 12.

⁵ Mark ii. 7.

³ Matt. v. *passim*.

believe that the cherubim are symbolic here, as always, of those created things of which Man is the appointed head. Here, specially, they symbolize Human Nature; and their appearance upon the mercy-seat is due to that cardinal truth of the Gospel that for the purpose of covering our sins by a real atonement the Son of God "took our Nature upon Him". It was indeed a Sinless Nature, like the pure gold of the cherubim, but it was true Human Nature; and it was united with the Deity, even as in the Holiest Place Law and Forgiveness and Glory are in and around and continuous with the human forms. It was Human Nature like that which had been left behind in Eden, yes, and like that which may soar on wings into the heavenly places, and this the Son of God was to assume so that he might be *set forth as a propitiatory*.¹ It cannot be without significance also that a warning is given to Moses of future legislation providing for an annual ceremony of covering of sins.² This ceremony was that of the great Day of Atonement, fully described in the Book of Leviticus, which we shall have to consider carefully later. It is sufficient to notice now that, as we might anticipate, the Place of Covering in the innermost sanctuary played an important part in that great Day of Covering. The central act of the day was the taking of the blood of the sin-offering of atonement into the Holiest Place, and the sprinkling of it upon the mercy-seat, on the front or eastern side, and also seven times before the mercy-seat. These two actions each had their significance; the second, as we shall see later, denoting the presentation of the atoning sacrifice to God, and the first, as we may well believe, completing the symbolism of the place of covering. The action *added* to this picture of our Christ that one particular which was necessary to complete it. Not the taking of the manhood into God alone, but the outpouring of His life-blood upon the Cross, consummated His atonement; for God set Him forth to be a propitiatory *in His blood*.³ In a strict enumeration of the contents of the Holiest Place we must then include the Blood upon the mercy-seat.

We have seen that the Holiest Place is made like the Divine Nature and Work of the Son of God; amongst the Divine acts being reckoned His assumption of sinless Human Nature and His dying in that Nature so that He might atone for the sins of the world. But we remember that this place was screened in its front and covered overhead with veil and

Rom. III. 25, Gk.

² Exod. xxx. 10.³ Rom. III. 25.

curtains, embroidered with golden cherubim, and with rich colours, so that the Divine glory was not seen without. If the cherubim represent Human Nature, then the veil and curtains, embroidered with this pattern, will represent the Body of our Lord which screened His Deity from view, in accordance with the writer to the Hebrews, who explains the veil as representing His Flesh.¹ The concealment of His true and proper Deity was indeed a necessary condition for our Lord "in the days of His flesh". But even as the glory of Jehovah sometimes flooded the whole house and tent, or appeared to all the people, so at Cana, and on the Mount of Transfiguration; so now by outflashings of power or insight, and now again by gentler shinings of grace and truth, men "surely knew their Sov'reign Lord was nigh". Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself said, however, that it was beyond the power of natural sight or discernment to see the truth about the Person of the Son of Man,² and the full revelation of this truth whether to disciples or to the world must necessarily await the completion of His life and work on earth. *When ye have lifted up the Son of Man*, said our Lord to the Jews, *then shall ye know that I AM.*³ It was, we believe, partly in connection with this fact, that one of the signs which followed His cry *It is finished*, was the rending of the Temple veil from top to bottom. The necessary screen was then removed. Not only the centurion was immediately to recognize Him as a righteous man, and a supernatural man, the Son of God, but in three short days He was to be declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead; to be worshipped by disciples as God and Lord; to be preached through all the world in the fulness of the Divine mystery that God Himself had become manifest in the flesh, and lived and died and risen again and ascended into Heaven, for us men and for our salvation.

The Holiest Place has thus been found to be in all particulars a picture of the Divine Nature of the Incarnate Son of God; the Holy Place will be found a no less complete representation of His Human Nature, not as displayed before men, but as offered to God. For we must remember that in the assumption of manhood the Son took upon Himself the real position of a Servant of God.⁴ It was thenceforward as incumbent upon Him as upon all men to fulfil all righteousness.⁵ It is this aspect of the life of His Son to which God draws our at-

¹ Heb. x. 20.

⁴ Phil. ii. 7.

² Matt. xvi. 17.

⁵ Matt. iii. 15.

³ John viii. 28.

tention by the arrangements of the Holy Place. There also we find, as in the inner sanctuary, three objects which invite consideration, the Table, the Candlestick, and the Golden Altar. We have seen reason to believe that the Shewbread is identical in idea with the meal-offering, and in a later chapter we shall show that the meal-offering represents the consecration of human activities to God. This consecration of His daily toil, whether in the humble home at Nazareth, or as the itinerant prophet and teacher of teachers; the lifting Godwards of all that each day brought to Him of life and duty in the path of His Father's Will, this was most fully realized in the life of the Son of Man. Nor do we think that it is without reference to Him that the unsullied meal-offering on the Table took the form of twelve loaves. This may well be a suggestion of the representative character of His obedience. He was no mere individual amongst countless others of the human race; He became the end of the Law for righteousness, potentially for all humanity and actually for the Israel of God. This, then, we take to be the purpose of the pure Table and its meal- and drink-offering spread in the presence of God. We come now to consider the Candlestick, which gave light over against the Table and generally in all the actions of the Holy Place. If the bread and wine on the Table signified the bodily activities of the Son of Man, the lamp-stand signified His moral and spiritual insight. *The spirit of man*, we are told in the Proverbs, *is the lamp of Jehovah*.¹ The seven lamps of the pure candlestick teach us that the spiritual perception and moral sense of the Son of Man were not flickering and uncertain, but full-orbed and clear. His was a spirit of wisdom and understanding, a spirit of counsel and might, a spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah. His delight—or as the expressive Hebrew phrase has it, His *scent*, or as we might say, His *taste*—was in the fear of Jehovah.² Nor is the blessed Spirit of God far from the imagery, as in the prophetic far-off view of this "spiritually-minded Man" it was foreseen that *the Spirit of Jehovah should rest upon Him*. But we do not think that this fact is at all prominent in the picture which we are considering, though it may be latent in the pure olive oil which was to be prepared for the lamp. Nor does the reference in the Book of the Revelation to *seven lamps before the throne, which are the seven Spirits of God*,³ really seem taken from the imagery of the tabernacle, so as to fix its meaning

¹ Prov. xx. 27; cf. Matt. vi. 22, 23; Luke xi. 33-36.

² Is. xi. 2, 3.

³ Rev. iv. 5; cf. i. 4; iii. 1; v. 6.

there; for the candlestick is not spoken of as *before* the ark and mercy-seat. Rather do we believe that the phraseology in the Revelation leads us to think of the Holy Spirit as *the bestower of all grace required by the human spirit*. And just here we find its point of contact with the imagery of the tabernacle candlestick. We see the Son of Man *possessed of all necessary graces*, with His human spirit completely enlightened and enabled by the Spirit of grace. Not in measure, but in His sevenfold plenitude of grace the Spirit rested upon Him at every stage of His human existence. It is interesting in this connection to compare the statements of the evangelist in regard to Jesus Christ and His great forerunner. Of the latter it is said that *the child grew and waxed strong in spirit*; but of the former that *the child grew and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him*.¹ The spirit of John was strengthened and enlightened by the filling of the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb. But the spirit of Jesus was in its growing capacity at all seasons filled full of the wisdom appropriate to the moment, by the abiding of the grace of God upon Him. The result was a full-orbed human character. To this fact in the history of the Son of Man we believe the golden candlestick of the Holy Place with its seven lamps fed with pure oil plainly to refer. We come now and lastly to the Altar of Incense. If the other two objects in this sacred spot referred to the bodily activities and the moral and spiritual character of the Son of Man, this undoubtedly refers to the converse of His spirit with God. The offering of incense is in Scripture the constant symbol of prayer taken in its widest sense; and no picture of the human life of our Redeemer which omitted this element in it, would have been complete, or indeed true to fact. It is unnecessary to do more than remind the reader of the frequency with which the prayers of our Lord are referred to in the Gospels. We gather indeed that the practice of prayer occupied a large part of His daily life.

It is interesting to notice in connection with this threefold picture of the human life of our Lord, how two epithets are applied in common to the three, and how these epithets as it were give the finishing touch to the picture. The first epithet is *pure*, which is the same word as is elsewhere used to describe the ceremonially clean. It is not simply on account of the *pure gold* which was used in the construction of table and

¹ Luke i, 80; ii, 40,

candlestick and altar, for the ark which was constructed in the same manner was not called "the pure ark". But the table is *the pure table*,¹ the candlestick *the pure candlestick*,² and the incense (not the altar) *the pure incense*.³ The reference certainly seems to be to the unsullied purity of life and character, and to the unmixed devotion of the Son of Man. The second epithet is that of *continuance*. The bread is set in order *continually*,⁴ and the lamps are to be ordered upon the candlestick *continually*,⁵ and the incense is to be a *perpetual incense*.⁶ It cannot be an over-refinement to see in these statements an assurance, not only that the life of the Saviour never swerved even for a moment from the path of the highest ideal, but also that it is constantly and for ever available for all who would come to God through Him.

Before we leave the tabernacle there are two other circumstances connected with it which call for special notice. Both of them are connected with the work of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Son of Man. We have seen that the presence and influence of the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit of our Lord may be part of the imagery of the golden candlestick. But we have expressed our belief that the intention there is to concentrate thought rather upon the *effect* of the Holy Spirit's work than upon the work itself. But if the whole picture is to be a true likeness of the incarnation of the Son of God, as related in the Gospels, the influence and operation of the Holy Spirit must not only find a place, but also a prominent place within it. This necessity, as we shall soon see, was fully present to the Divine Mind.

One of the special oracles connected with the construction of the tabernacle referred to the manufacture and use of the anointing oil.⁷ This sacred oil was to be used only in the consecration of the tabernacle and altar and of its ministers. When giving the instructions for the actual erection of the whole, the ceremony of anointing again finds special mention.⁸ As an actual fact the tabernacle and tent were erected and occupied by the glory of Jehovah on the first day of the first month, while the consecration by anointing was deferred for a few days, but was carried out⁹ before the full inauguration of the tabernacle service. The anointing of the tent and tabernacle and of every part of it was then a prominent part of the imagery. And indeed it could not have been otherwise in a

¹ Lev. xxiv. 6.² Exod. xxxi. 8.³ *Ib.* xxxvii. 29.⁴ Lev. xxiv. 8.⁵ *Ib.* xxiv. 4.⁶ Exod. xxx. 8.⁷ *Ib.* xxx. 22-33.⁸ *Ib.* xl. 9-15.⁹ Lev. viii. 10-12.

picture of THE CHRIST OF GOD, who was not only conceived by the Holy Spirit but sustained in His human life by the same ever-present power.¹

But there is one other circumstance in the story of the tabernacle which seems to carry the similitude still further. The very first words with which Jehovah approaches the subject of His residence with Israel, are a call to Israel themselves to give what they have. *Speak unto the children of Israel that they take for Me an offering; of every man whose heart maketh him willing ye shall take My offering.*² The very last words which refer to the subject give the promise of the Divine Spirit to the chosen agents of His will, who shall perform all that God has commanded and designed. *See, I have called by name Bezalel . . . and have filled him with the Spirit of God . . . and I have appointed with him Oholiab . . . and in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted I have put wisdom that they may make all that I have commanded thee.*³ May we not see here a far-off picture, yet one that is tenderly true to life, of the call which came to a *Virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the Virgin's name was Mary*. Like the chosen in Israel she gave with a willing heart, *Behold, the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word*. Like them also, but for the accomplishment of a far higher work, she received the Holy Spirit. *The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee, wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God, Emmanuel, that God may dwell with us.*

THE ALTAR.

We have already had occasion once and again to remark what seems to be an undoubted fact, that the Altar is not regarded as an accessory of the Tabernacle, but as co-ordinate with it. The Laver, on the other hand, we have seen to be a mere accessory of both. This is not to say that the symbolism of the laver is unimportant, and we shall have more to say on this point when we come to speak of the service in the sanctuary and at the altar. But the important thing in connection with the interpretation of the Altar is to remember that it occupies a position corresponding to that of the Tabernacle. We have seen already that the Tabernacle presents a complete picture of the Son of God. The cardinal truths of

¹ Acts x. 38.

² Exod. xxv, 2,

³ 1b, xxxi. 1-11,

His twofold Nature, His incarnation by the Holy Ghost through the Virgin Mary, His fulfilment of the human ideal, and the fact of His Atoning Death, have one and all found expression there. We may then expect to find a similar completeness in the symbolism of the Altar, if the two are really co-ordinate. And this, as a fact, we shall do; although the emphasis lies in this case upon a different portion of the concrete whole. We may truly say that while both Tabernacle and Altar contain views of the Person and of the Work of Christ, the emphasis in the Tabernacle lies upon the truth of His Person, and in the Altar upon the truth of His Work.

If this general principle holds good, we shall find in the symbolism of the Altar, though not perhaps occupying a prominent position there, some likeness to the unique Person of the Incarnate Son. It will be remembered in this connection that we have shown that the Altar consisted of two parts, even as the tabernacle contained two Holy Places. This fact is not emphasized in the record, but it seems undoubtedly to be present there. Can we then be wrong in regarding the two parts of the altar as parallel to the two parts of the tabernacle, and signifying, generally, the twofold nature of Christ? As in the tabernacle access was obtained first to the Holy Place and thence to the Holiest, so in the construction of the Altar, the priest mounted by the earthen base to the upper altar of brass. We take the base of the altar then to be a real, though compared with the imagery of the tabernacle a faint picture of the Human Nature of the Christ. And here we see—though again but faintly—the same elements of truth which were emphasized there. This Altar Base is of the same materials as the ground around it, and continuous with it, but yet raised above the common level.¹ No tool of man has fashioned it, or pollution of man fastened upon it.² The correspondence between these details and what has been said above of the imagery of the tabernacle is too close to be accidental. This is an outline merely, but a closely accurate outline, of those cardinal truths of the Human Nature of our Lord of which we have spoken above, and which we need not here repeat. The Brazen Altar which crowned this base, in the distinct character of its material substance, and in its detachment from no less than in its essential connection with the base, is a perfectly true, though comparatively very faint, picture of the Divine Nature of the Saviour. This then we take

¹ Exod. xx, 24.

² *Ib.*, verse 25.

to be the symbolism of the Altar so far as it foreshadows the Person of the Son of God. But if this portion of the picture is less defined, and less full, than in the tabernacle imagery, the Work of the Son of God is here drawn out and developed far beyond what we have seen in the details of the sanctuary. Here is to be imaged with the greatest particularity and distinctness the representative character of the work of Christ. Here is to be shown for whom He lived that Life, the intrinsic worth of which has been mirrored in the Holy Place; here too is seen the full story of that Death whose blood appeared upon the place of covering. What was but hinted at in the twelve loaves of the pure table is the main theme of the altar for burnt-offering; that dull stain on the pure gold of the mercy-seat becomes a series of life-surrenders upon the place of slaying.¹ Into the ritual of the altar we cannot enter further here. It is indeed the theme upon which we are about to embark in the succeeding chapters of this book. Here we will only remark how we have now been carried by our argument straight to the conclusion that that ritual, unless it is to be in violent contradiction to its whole environment, must be like the Son of God. We shall find that it is not without some indications of the wonder of His Person, but we shall be prepared to discover that it is more occupied with a delineation of His Work.

It is certainly not without significance that in the Divine scheme the slaying of sacrificial victims took place not actually upon the altar, as the Hebrew term for the place (*a place of slaughter*) would seem to show had been customary.² In the tabernacle ritual all this took place on the north side of the altar, and in most cases at some distance from it, but the blood of the killing was in every case brought to the altar. Still it is true that in this legislation the altar is constantly and distinctively *the Altar of Burnt-offering*.³ This title may have been attached to it for several reasons. We believe for one thing that the burnt-offering was the original form of animal sacrifice; and it is certainly the case that whatever parts of other sacrifices were consumed upon it were there consumed as a burnt-offering. In fact the function of this altar in the Divine purpose seems to have been distinctively to *cause offerings to ascend*. Upon this erection everything that would be lifted to God must be placed, not only the substitutionary

¹ Altar is in the original *Mizbeach*, a place of slaughter.

² See also Gen. xxii. 9, 10.

³ First in Exod. xxx. 28 and xxxi. 29, but in xxvii. 1, simply *the altar*.

offerings of sacrificial victims, but every meal-offering of the Israelites, which represented the sum of their labours, must ascend to God by this stair; and they must do so not only upon the Person but also upon the Work there symbolized. For while the altar stood continually there, there also perpetually smoked the fires of the continual burnt-offering.¹ We can imagine no clearer or more striking illustration of the truth that the spiritual sacrifices offered by the people of God rise only upon the Person and Work of the Saviour; yes, even the spiritual sacrifice of prayer must be lifted upon this altar-fire and by no other, and the memorial of our activities must turn into incense-smoke kindled by the same flame, and by no other. But to these things we shall return in later chapters. It seems sufficient now to draw attention to the general truth that the Brazen Altar is pre-eminently the place of lifting mankind towards God. *We have an Altar*, says the writer to the Hebrews,² referring surely to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and including in the word not only the altar pile, but *all things thereon*, as we have done in our exposition, and as our Lord Himself asserted an essential connection to subsist between the two.³

When speaking of the Altar and its significance, we are conscious that the subject includes the whole of that which will occupy us in the following chapters, for around this Altar the whole symbolism of sacrificial worship gathers. The sacrificial ritual again will be seen to link the twin symbols of Tabernacle and Altar, and throw light upon the significance of details and the connection of parts in both. So that although we now bid farewell to tabernacle and altar, we shall return to them frequently, and still further develop what has here been stated only in broadest outline. But before finally passing to the consideration of the priesthood we must mark how the altar also, no less than the tabernacle, is anointed with the holy oil so that it may not be without this essential likeness to the Christ.⁴

THE PRIESTHOOD.

We have learned in the preceding chapter that in the true idea of the tabernacle service the Priesthood is the sole prerogative of one man; although by a practical necessity the sons of this man were associated with him in the priestly min-

¹ Exod. xxix. 38-42; Lev. vi. 8-13.

² Heb. xiii. 10, ³ Matt. xxiii. 29,

⁴ Lev. viii. 11,

istrations. It cannot be doubted that the restriction of priestly service in the tabernacle to the descendants of one man, and the inclusion of all the descendants of that one man in the responsibility, are emphasized with a purpose; neither can we doubt that the object in view is to present a real likeness of the eternal truth that there is *one mediator between God and men*.¹ There never has been and never will be any other such mediator than one, the Son of God. Any mediating priesthood then which formed a part of Divine direction and institution must of necessity conform to this eternal fact, if it was not to inculcate plain error, a thing which is manifestly impossible with God. But if the priesthood of the tabernacle belonged to Aaron and to Aaron alone, it is no less clear that Aaron did not take this honour upon himself, but was called to it by the Divine decree. This also, we have been taught by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews,² is in strict correspondence with eternal facts. The mediatorship of the Son of God is the result of a Divine decree, uttered by the Father (if we may use human language to express Divine realities) in the hearing of His Son, and by that Son made known through His Spirit in the prophets. To this call and dedication we believe our Lord Himself referred when He says that He was *sanctified and sent into the world*.³

But if the fact of Aaron's call and the singularity of his position were designed to correspond with an eternal archetype, we may be sure that the details of his equipment and of his office were framed with the same purpose. We are convinced in fact that the object both of the elaborate vestments of the priest, and the still more complex ritual of his consecration, is one and the same, namely, to cause this selected man to present a real likeness to the One Mediator. With this principle to guide us we now turn to consider the service of consecration of Aaron, during the course of which we shall have occasion to examine in detail also his vestments.

THE RITE OF CONSECRATION.

We have already described this service in its ritual programme, and we shall accordingly assume that the details are present to the mind of the reader, and only recall them so far as it is necessary to do so for the purpose of their exposition. We have interpreted both tabernacle and altar as having

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

² Heb. v. 4-6.

³ John x. 36.

been made like the Christ, and we are about to show how Aaron also was made to be a true image of Him. But it is necessary to bear in mind that this was not done once only, at the initiation of the scheme, but that there was a yearly repetition by which tabernacle and altar and priest were ceremonially cleansed from the imperfections and impurities inherent in them or contracted by them, and again fashioned according to the true likeness. The occasion referred to is of course the annual Day of Atonement, which may well be described as an annual rectification of the whole system, so as to keep it, as closely as might be, true to its pattern and in tune with the eternal melody. It must not be forgotten also that this whole consecration service was to be repeated on each occasion when a priest succeeded to his father's office,¹ and that the service of consecration of priests included a rite of consecration of the altar.² It is of great interest to note the fact that when a new priest was consecrated a fresh consecration of the altar was also necessary. It suggests an essential identity between the two, and we shall see as we proceed that this identity really exists. In a true sense the priest *is* the altar, including in the word both the altar itself and all things thereon; just as we shall soon see clearly by obviously designed marks of identity that the priest *is* the tabernacle. But the tabernacle, which was consecrated by Moses at the consecration of Aaron,³ was not apparently reconsecrated upon every succession to the priesthood. We may account for this fact by the consideration that the reconsecration of the tabernacle and all that was in it would have required a far more elaborate ceremony, and one which would have called for an entry into the Holiest Place on seven successive days, and would thus have seriously detracted from the impressiveness of the great annual Day of Atonement if it had become part of the regular service of consecration of the high priest. The connection of the priest with the tabernacle was sufficiently marked in other ways, and so, as we believe, it was not specially emphasized on each succession to the office of high priest. We cannot omit all reference here, when the subject of the likeness of the priest to the Son of God is before us, to the very moving fact that the death of the high priest brought pardon and restoration to the manslayer.⁴ Although the regulation is not made in connection with the tabernacle ritual, yet it is perhaps for that very reason all the more elo-

¹ Exod. xxix. 30.³ Lev. viii. 10.² *Ib.* 35-37.⁴ Num. xxxv. 28.

quent of the ever-present significance of the high-priestly office in the mind of God.

A prime necessity in any likeness to the true Mediator is the possession of purity, and this we have seen emphasized in the pure table and candlestick and incense of the sanctuary, as well as in the freedom from pollution of the altar base. Here, too, it is emphasized in the ceremonial washing of Aaron.

The pure priest is now arrayed in his garments of office. The white linen breeches and coat are in accordance with the ceremonial purity of his person. A girdle embroidered in the three colours of blue and purple and scarlet confines the white linen coat. These three colours, sometimes in combination, sometimes singly, as in the covering cloths or loops of the tabernacle curtains, we have seen to be characteristic of the tabernacle. It may be that a special significance attaches to each of these colours; but unless they occur singly and where some significance is to be expected we prefer to regard them as simply *for glory and for beauty*.¹

The white ground of the veil and curtains of the tabernacle was brightened and beautified by these colours, and also the entrance screen before the tent. So, too, a bright coloured girdle confined the white tunic of the high priest. We take this to be indicative of the moral beauty of the character of Christ. In human nature moral uprightness is not always allied with attractiveness of character, but in the Incarnate Son of God every moral perfection and beauty is evenly displayed. It cannot surely be without significance that we find these colours not only within the holy place where they were present to the eye of God alone, but also in the screen which stood before the entrance to the tent, in a position which must have been visible to all within the tabernacle enclosure; and again upon the screen at the entrance to that enclosure, so that even the uncircumcised stranger might catch some glimpse of the glories and beauties within. We remember that the moral beauty of the life of our Redeemer was not only *well pleasing* in the sight of His Father, but also attracted the attention of His fellow-villagers in Nazareth and of countless others who saw Him; while in our day far beyond the limits of those who are in covenant with Him His moral glory and beauty are praised. But we are now considering the high priest in his likeness to this Mediator Man, and we notice that he is made like Him in this respect also; and that

¹ Exod. xxviii. 2.

within, where no eye of man reaches, He is possessed of moral purity and beauty. We shall see later that this same perfection of moral character is presented also—as in the tabernacle imagery—to human observation, but at present we contemplate Him only as all-glorious within, in the sight of His Father in heaven.

We now come to those vestments which are distinctive of the Mediator, the robe of the ephod, the ephod itself with its girdle, its shoulder ornaments, and its breastplate with Urim and Thummim. We believe that these taken in combination give a complete view of the Person of our Christ, comparable to the faint picture afforded by the altar-structure, and the far more vivid representation of the tabernacle itself. The innermost robe of the ephod, being made wholly of blue, we feel to be a beautiful and fitting picture of the Divine Nature of the Mediator. We do not insist that wherever this colour occurs in the tabernacle scheme it is to be interpreted in this sense, but where, as here, it is strongly emphasized in the material of a vestment, we cannot but seek for some special significance in it. And if so, what other interpretation can we put upon it than a *heavenly* one? We believe, then, that the robe teaches us that the one Mediator between God and men is Himself in the very form of God.¹ Upon the skirts of this robe there were golden bells and objects like pomegranates in shape, made of threads of white and the three colours, these alternating with each other round the bottom of the robe, and the bells making a sound as the high priest walked. We find here attached to the robe of pure blue the gold and blue and purple and scarlet which are the colours of the tabernacle veil and curtains and also of the ephod. We conclude that the presence of these upon the robe of the ephod is a sign that it is in real connection with the ephod. The fact of a connection is already marked by its name, it is distinctively the robe of the ephod, but this connection is further emphasized by the presence of the ephod colours and materials upon it in their regular combination. We believe that this indicates what we know to be the truth that the Mediator unites the two Natures in one Person. But we have still to explain why the gold and white with three colours, which seem everywhere to represent

¹ We may recall, in confirmation of our interpretation, the striking fact that whenever the people saw the Ark carried in procession, it was covered with a cloth *all of blue* (Num. iv. 6). The Ark alone was distinguished in this way, all else belonging to the sanctuary having the coverings of sealskin outermost. But the Ark was always to the people the symbol of the Divine Presence; so that this colour already possessed a connection with Deity.

the human nature of the Christ, are attached to the robe in the form of pomegranates and bells, and not, for example, embroidered on its hem. We may think that their attachment as a fringe is more appropriate to picture the assumption of human nature by the Son of God, than a method by which they would appear as part of the material of the robe. But we confess that it is not easy to give a reason for the pendant threads being in the shape of pomegranates, and not in the form of a fringe or tassels.¹ There may be some very simple practical reason, such, for example, as that tassels might impede while balls even assisted the motion of the bells. At all events no special significance attaches in Scripture to the fruit of the pomegranate, and in the words of God to Moses regarding the significance of this vestment attention is directed only to the sound of the bells. The suggestion is hazarded that the word pomegranate may have some technical meaning in the language of dress ornamentation, and is not to be understood quite literally in this connection. The important point evidently was that the sound of Aaron was to be heard when he went into the holy place and when he came out, *that he die not*. The sound was the sound emitted by the bells of the robe, and the robe was the symbol of the possession of a nature essentially Divine. In the power of His Divine nature the Son of God approaches God; eternally possessed of this He enters the Divine presence or leaves it for our succour and relief. Not even the spotless purity and surpassing grace of the human nature which He assumed could in itself secure Him access to the Creator of all things, *whom no man hath seen, nor can see*.² But He of whom these things are written *is* by His own nature *in heaven*,³ and moves by the sound of His own glory unhindered there.

Over the cerulean robe was hung the ephod. This garment was in its materials and workmanship identical with the veil and curtains of the tabernacle. These we have already found to be a symbol of the Human Nature which our Lord assumed. The robe has assured us of His possession of a nature truly Divine, and on its border has been hung the memorial of the nature which He assumed in order to be the Mediator between God and men. But a whole vestment must be provided for the delineation of that second nature of which our Mediator is possessed, and to show what manner of Man He became. It does not seem to be certain that the gold em-

¹ Num. xv. 37-41.

² 1 Tim. vi. 16; cf. Exod. xxxiii. 20 and John i. 18.

³ John iii. 13.

broidery of the ephod and its parts took the form of cherubim as in the veil and curtains of the tabernacle ; neither on the other hand can it be asserted that it did not do so. But whether it did so or not, the two are evidently intended to correspond to one another so closely that we are compelled to take them as symbolical of the same truth. The ephod with its shoulder-straps, girdle, and breastplate then we take to be a symbol of the Human Nature of our Priest, even as the robe was the symbol of His Divine Nature. But as the robe carried the memorial of the ephod, so the ephod in its breastplate enshrined *the Lights and the Perfections*, the memorial of the robe. The dominant idea of the one vestment, however, is the Deity, and of the other the Humanity in the single Person of the Mediator. It will be remembered that upon the shoulder-straps there were two onyx stones, enclosed in gold settings, on which were inscribed the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. The significance of this is apparent ; it is also clearly stated, *Aaron shall bear their names before Jehovah upon his two shoulders for a memorial*. The assumption of our humanity was a necessary condition of bearing our responsibility. But this the Son of God undertook, and He now upholds, upbears in the presence of the Holiest the names, that is the whole individual responsibilities, of the covenant people of God. Upon His breast also, near to His heart, and resting again in and upon those symbols of His own human nature, the breastplate and the embroidered girdle, he bears our names ; enshrined there as precious gems each in its own firm setting and of a piece with the breastplate which is Himself—how can we exhaust the suggestions of this precious symbol ? We are not careful to decide the nature of each gem, or assign them among the twelve tribes ; rather do we think that the impression to be conveyed is the general one that all His saints are on His heart, as in His hand, and all alike are precious. There may be in the similarity of the two onyx stones, where all the names are found, and the variety in the stones of the breastplate, where no two names are upon identical gems, a further suggestion of the common standing and the varied endowments of the people of God. In one Person only do all the graces which may adorn human nature meet and blend in unsullied perfection ; other men display but this quality or that, according to the measure of the gift of God to them. But the Scripture itself bids us think mainly of the truth that the names were to be *upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before Jehovah*. We are instantly carried in

thought to the truth of the Gospel that we have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and the assurance that He ever liveth to make intercession for us. The continuance of this recollection and care by the Mediator for the people whom He represents is emphasized in the symbol¹ as strongly as in the open Gospel; and we recall the fact that it is the message of the last words spoken by our Saviour before He was received up, when He said, *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.* And here again we come to a truth of the deepest significance and importance. The care and recollection of His people is after all not the main, or at least not the only truth which is here symbolized. It is not alone a bearing of the names upon the heart, great and precious though that be, but it is *the bearing of the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart* which is equally emphasized. Aaron had always at heart the necessity and the appointed means for ascertaining and making known to the people whom he represented the mind and will of God. For the children of Israel enquired of him, and the answer received through *the lights and the perfections* was the answer of God with whom is no darkness at all.

There are some, alas! who would have us believe that our Mediator is not the sole and final authority in the things of God. It may well be in view of such deadly error as this that this point finds special mention and emphasis in the picture of the true Mediator. He must be one who, not with partial knowledge or imperfect expression, but with full knowledge and real finality, makes known to us the will of God. Enquiry of Him must realize the symbolism of *the lights and the perfections*. Now it is quite certain from the gospel histories that our Lord Jesus assumed these functions. He professed to give authoritative judgments. He has given His answer to the enquiry as to the trustworthiness and the Divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. He prepared a witnessing apostolate to proclaim the message of Himself, and promised to them the guidance of His Spirit of truth. He chose an additional apostle to bear His Name in an especial way throughout the world. Did He then leave things to themselves? to a merely natural development? and take no care for the transmission of His own teachings? or for that of His own carefully selected and appointed messengers. It is quite incredible. It is also totally at variance with the fact that Aaron

¹ Exod. xxviii. 29, 30.

was to *bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before Jehovah continually*. No, we say again that the demand revolts against our common sense, it makes too great a demand upon our credulity, it is impossible that our Mediator should forget our need for authoritative decisions in the things of God. If He ever lives to make intercession for us, He has also from the first moment until now taken thought that the truth shall abide with us, and that we shall have a touchstone to discern things that differ, and to know what the will of the Lord is. But if that touchstone is not the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the living Church since the times of the Apostles has always believed it to be, no such touchstone exists in the world to-day.

It should be noticed before we pass on to speak of the mitre and crown of the high priest, how the representative character of his office, which was just hinted at in the twelve loaves of shewbread, is brought into great prominence here by the twelve names upon his shoulders and on his breastplate. This is another illustration, in addition to several which have been already mentioned, of an identity of reference in the two figures of tabernacle and priesthood, though the emphasis in either on particular points may be varied. A further link between the two, which may also be mentioned, is the fact that while the breastplate was bound to its kindred ephod by chains of gold and laces of blue, the two sets of tabernacle curtains were joined to one another by clasps of gold and loops of blue. The point is a slight one, but it finds distinct mention in each case, and is probably intended to help in establishing an identity of reference in the two symbols.

We come now to the mitre and holy crown of the high priest. It seems clear that the mitre was simply regarded as a foundation on which to set the holy crown. The two are connected by a lace of blue. They must have been connected in some way, and we are not disposed to attach any special significance to the lace of blue. But it is not impossible that the white linen and pure gold are faintly symbolic of the pure and rich Humanity of the Mediator, while the blue lace may also be faintly indicative of His ever-present Deity.

The Divine record, however, lays all the stress upon the significance of the crown engraved with the words Holy to Jehovah. *It shall be upon Aaron's forehead, and Aaron shall bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon*

his forehead, that they may be accepted before Jehovah.¹ The meaning of these words seems to be that the obligation to holiness which lay upon the children of Israel, and which they failed in fulfilling, would be undertaken by Aaron on their behalf, and by him fulfilled, so that they for his sake might be accepted before Jehovah. But Aaron was not only to bear their obligation to holiness; he was also to bear their iniquity. The phrase *to bear iniquity* occurs frequently in connection with the priesthood. Here, for example, Aaron is to bear the iniquity of the holy things of the children of Israel, as much as to say he is to bear the responsibility for the shortcomings in their service and worship of God. Again we read that the whole Levite body, including the priests, were to *bear the iniquity of the sanctuary*,² that is apparently to be responsible for all the shortcomings of the place, both in connection with the care and with the worship of the sanctuary. The priests themselves were to *bear the iniquity of their priesthood*.³ Now it is clear from many passages that to undertake responsibility for iniquity is to incur guilt;⁴ and such we believe to be the exact meaning of the phrase here. The priesthood was established to do all that was necessary in the matter of holiness so that Israel might be accepted before Jehovah; and for this reason the priest bore on his forehead the legend HOLY TO JEHOVAH. To this end he was bound to a peculiar sanctity of life and conduct,⁵ so that they too might be sanctified in him. To this end also, and this is a point of the greatest importance, he was bound to expiate their guilt. And here we come directly to the connecting-link between the symbol which we are now considering and that which is to form the subject of our study in the succeeding chapters, namely, the expiatory offerings of the law. In the symbolic system Aaron *bore the iniquity that bringeth guilt*,⁶ but in actual fact the sacrificial victims, and especially the victims of the sin-offering, expiated it. He did not himself lay down his life, the sin-offering victim did so. But the flesh of this offering was to be eaten by the priests with the express purpose of showing that priest and victim were one in this matter of expiation. God *gave the sin-offering to Aaron to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before Jehovah*.⁷ It was only when he offered a sin-offering for himself that the priest was not allowed to eat its flesh, but it was

¹ Exod. xxviii. 38.

² *Ib.* *ib.*

³ *Ib.* *ib.*

⁴ Num. xviii. 1a; and see verse 23.

⁵ See, for example, Lev. v. 1, 2, 17.

⁶ *Ib.* xxii. 16.

⁷ *Ib.* x. 17.

wholly burned with fire outside the camp, because no man can expiate his own guilt. But in all other cases, where he was personating the work of the one Mediator, he was obliged to identify himself with the sin-offering victim by eating its flesh, to exhibit the vital truth that the one Mediator was also the one Victim for the sins of the whole world. This then is the crown of the whole picture. The Person of whom these things are written is not only both Human and Divine, and possessed of all necessary attributes as the Representative of men and the medium of their knowledge of God, He has, moreover, taken upon Himself the sole responsibility of making them HOLY TO JEHOVAH; giving His own life in atonement for their guilt, and offering to God the consecration of Himself so as to gain thereby their acceptance before Jehovah. Can there then be any doubt that these things were intentionally made like the person and the office of our Redeemer?

After investment with his robes of office the holy anointing oil was poured plentifully upon the head of the priest; which was so marked a feature of his consecration that he was thereafter known as *the anointed priest*,¹ and his consecration day as *the day when he was anointed*.² The importance of this feature in any portrait of THE CHRIST is sufficiently obvious, and has been already remarked upon in connection with both tabernacle and altar. The anointing of Aaron is one more of their many points in common, which establish an identity of reference in the three great pictures of tabernacle, altar, and priest; and we are struck by the deep significance of the fact that these three received their first anointing at the same moment.³

We might have thought Aaron to be now sufficiently like his great Archetype at once to assume his priestly duties. But it was not so in the mind of Him who planned this ritual, and this we think for two reasons. In the first place, it had been shown that the office of Aaron was to obtain acceptance for Israel by the expiation of their sins and by his own consecration to Jehovah. But this could only be possible for one who was united with them by nature indeed, but separated from them in all their transgressions and in all their shortcomings. He who atoned for sin must himself be sinless, and he who introduced men to God must himself be acceptable to Him. The true and only Mediator between God and men is in His human nature *holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from*

¹ Lev. IV. 3, etc.² *Ib.* VI. 20.³ *Ib.* VIII. 10-12.

sinner,¹ and like Him in this respect Aaron must yet be made. It was not sufficient that he should be washed, and vested, or even anointed; a special ceremonial act must take place to show that he was separated from sins and endued with acceptable righteousness. A second reason for further ritual acts is that the whole tide of symbolism is now setting with accelerated motion towards that sacrificial system, which was to show how the Mediator did what he was appointed to do. And so if Aaron is to be made like One who was separated from sin, it shall be by the offering of a sin-offering; and if he is to be made like One who was possessed of righteousness, it shall be by the offering of a burnt-offering. And on this account also the whole service is concluded by a sacrificial rite, and one which establishes an identity between Priest and Victim. The service of consecration then leaves us satisfied that, as the sacrificial ritual is developed, it is quite sure to be along the line of likeness to the Son of God, which we have seen to be the ruling principle in the ordinances of the priesthood.

Of these three sacrificial acts, the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the ram of consecration we have now to speak; and in doing so it will be impossible not to anticipate the conclusions of the following chapters of this book. As has already been remarked the ritual here appointed for the sin-offering and burnt-offering formed the precedent for the ritual prescribed for similar offerings in the future. The ritual for the ram of consecration again, in some of its parts, formed the basis of the future ritual for peace-offerings. We are therefore obliged to interpret the sacrificial rites of this chapter in accordance with the interpretation afterwards to be given to these three types of offering. We can do no more in this place than state the conclusions which we think to be certain with regard to each of these.

The sin-offering offered on Aaron's behalf was significant of the removal of his guilt. The responsibility for the sins he had committed was symbolically transferred to the head of the victim, by the laying on of his hands; and, by the death of the victim on his behalf, his sins were covered and forgiven.² So Aaron was made like One *in whom is no sin*.³

¹ Heb. vii. 26.

² It may be objected that in Lev. viii. 15 atonement is said to be made for the altar, while nothing is said of atonement being made for Aaron. But in the ritual of sin-offerings atonement is always made for the person who lays hands upon the offering, so that Aaron is the person atoned for here. In Exod. xxix. directions are first given for a sin-offering for Aaron (vv. 10-14) and afterwards for the cleansing of the altar by the same sacrifice (vv. 35-37). The altar then is associated with the priest in cleansing as it had been in anointing.

³ 1 John iii. 5.

The burnt-offering offered on Aaron's behalf was significant of the imputation to him of a righteousness which was accepted by Jehovah. Here also he symbolically transferred a responsibility which he could not himself fulfil to the head of another. That other was (ceremonially) possessed of a purity to which he himself could not lay claim, and offered (ceremonially) a total consecration to which he himself could not attain, and these were accepted in his stead. So Aaron was made like One *who is the end of the law for righteousness*.¹

The ram of peace-offering offered on Aaron's behalf showed him to be in the enjoyment of fellowship with God. Here again he transferred all his responsibilities to the head of another. That other not only poured out life-blood which atoned for his sins, and offered a total consecration on his behalf, but became the means by which he enjoyed fellowship with God at His table. In this way Aaron became a true likeness of Him whose fellowship with God is ever unbroken.

The likeness of Aaron to the true Mediator is now complete, and it is time that he displayed the manner in which mediation was to be effected. This we take to be the intention of those ritual acts which in the sacrifice of the ram of consecration were added to what was afterwards to become the ordinary ritual of peace-offerings. The ritual special to this occasion we remember to be (1) the putting of the blood of the ram upon the ear, hand, and foot of Aaron; (2) the sprinkling of his person and garments with blood and oil; (3) the placing of the Lord's portion in his hands while it was being waved by Moses.² There seems to be a twofold significance in these acts. In the first place, there is evidently an initiation of Aaron to the office of the priesthood, for the act of waving or heaving is always the function of the priest. It is here performed by Moses, the representative of the ancient priesthood; but he inducts Aaron to the office and functions of the priesthood by laying the offerings on his hands as he waves them before Jehovah. But there is more than mere investiture with office and functions; it is not a rite of consecration alone, but a rite of *filling the hands*. And in this lies the further and chief significance of the act. Aaron is given *somewhat to offer*: and in the ram that was offered that day there is a picture of what the true Mediator is to lay upon the altar. There is no form of sacrifice better adapted than the sacrifice of peace-offerings to

¹ Rom. x. 4.

² This is the order of enumeration in Exod. xxix. In the actual ceremony the order of (2) and (3) is reversed (Lev. viii.).

present a summary of this truth. It is indeed an epitome of all substitutionary sacrifice, containing within itself the atonement made by blood-shedding, the acceptance won through consecration, and the fellowship realized through mediation. The work of Aaron was to offer sacrifices to do all these things; as indeed he actually began to do on the very first day after his consecration was completed. *He came down*, we are told, *from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering and the peace-offerings*.¹ In token of this the flesh of the peace-offerings was on the day of consecration placed upon his hands. But it is of the deepest significance that while the flesh of the peace-offerings was upon his hands, its blood was upon his ear and hand and foot, and sprinkled upon his person and upon his garments. Are we not to see in this fact a suggestion that Priest and Offering are one and the same? We have already seen that while the Priest bore the iniquity the Offering paid the penalty, and that Offering and Priest were identified by the Priest consuming the flesh of the sin-offerings. So we believe that at the consecration of Aaron the same truth is present, and we see a real likeness to the true Mediator who should put away sin by no other sacrifice than *the sacrifice of Himself*.²

But there are a few points remaining which call for consideration. We notice the presence of the anointing oil not only in connection with the Person of the Mediator, as we have seen it poured plentifully upon the head of Aaron, but also in connection with his sacrificial work. The blood which after the rite of consecration³ was sprinkled upon his person and garments was mingled with the anointing oil. May this not once more remind us that the sacred Body of our Redeemer was *prepared* for Him by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and was made through its long trial of obedience a clean and pure offering for the sins of the world by the continual presence and filling of the same Divine Power. He both took flesh and prepared it for offering in the power of the Holy Spirit. When we come to consider the offerings in detail we shall see that there are not many opportunities for introducing this cardinal truth of the Gospel into the symbolism. But it is here stamped upon the whole system of substitutionary offering by the simple but most significant act of mingling the anointing oil with the blood with which the person and garments of the Sacrificer are sprinkled. So too the figure of Offerings is linked to that of

¹ Lev. ix. 22.² Heb. ix. 26.³ Lev. viii. 30.

Priest and Altar and Tabernacle. Once more we notice that three parts of the high priest's body are marked with the blood—his ear, his hand, his foot. This must surely be significant of his functions. The high priest is evidently to hear the words of God that he may instruct the people of God;¹ he has also to lift every offering Godwards; and on their behalf to enter into the Holiest Place. In this way he becomes a striking figure of the one Mediator between God and men. The Son of God speaks to us what He has heard from the Father. Every sacrifice which reaches the Throne is offered by Him or presented through Him. He has passed through the heavens to appear in the presence of God for us.

Finally we recall the fact that the consecration rites of Aaron were repeated for seven days before he actually took upon himself the responsibilities of his office. In this way he was perfected. The very fact of repetition day after day must have emphasized the inherent weakness of the symbolic rites.² But their repetition for *seven days* was a promise of perfection in the reality to which they were likened; for *the law appointed men high priests having infirmity*, but God appointed *a Son perfected for evermore*.³

SUPPLEMENTARY.

In our consideration of the Priesthood we have confined ourselves to the study of the High Priest Aaron. But it is necessary to enquire what is the position of the sons of Aaron in the general scheme. It is not sufficient to answer that as a matter of practical necessity the service of the tabernacle required the presence of many ministers, and that we need seek for no symbolic reference in the general body of the priests. It is quite true, however, that Aaron stands in a different category from them, and that he only is made like the one Mediator. In the great argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews, up to the point where it reaches its conclusion in the words *Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin*,⁴ we find constant use made of the likeness of the Levitical Priesthood to the Son of God. But it is highly significant that the comparison is always drawn from the high priest, with only one exception;⁵ and in this place there is scarcely an exception, for though the text reads *every priest*, some authorities have *every high priest*, and moreover the

¹ Lev. x. 11: Deut. xvii. 8-13; xxxi. 9-13; xxxiii. 10; Mal. ii. 7.

² Heb. x. 1, 2.

³ *Ib.* vii. 28.

⁴ *Ib.* x. 18.

⁵ *Ib.* ii. ; *And every priest indeed standeth day by day*, etc.

point of the passage is rather one of contrast than of likeness. It is quite clear indeed that to the writer of this Epistle the high priest alone is the subject of comparison with Christ. And this is, as of course it must be, in close agreement with the Old Testament record. It is not merely that Aaron alone was vested in those garments which bear a special likeness to the unique Person of the Mediator; nor again simply because he alone received the sacred unction, though these two facts are sufficient to separate him from all the other priests. But upon the inauguration of the tabernacle service Aaron alone is the minister.¹ The only reference to his sons is the statement thrice repeated,² that they presented the blood of the victims to Aaron; and an implication that they arranged portions of one of them in their proper order.³ But Moses addresses all his directions to Aaron alone and not to his sons, and Aaron alone performs all the ceremonial acts. The history is also in complete correspondence with this. In the matter of Korah, Aaron single-handed makes the necessary atonement; and upon the rod of Levi, Aaron's name alone was written. But most significant of all is the solemn rite of the Day of Atonement, when all other priests were excluded while the high priest alone made atonement both for his own household, that is, for the whole body of priests, and for the people generally.⁴ It is quite clear that the whole service of the tabernacle throughout the year depended upon the work of the high priest acting alone on that great day. But it is precisely this which gives us the key, as we believe, to the symbolism of the ordinary priesthood. The ordinary priests, except when they are acting as offerers for the high priest, are not a picture of the Mediator. But they are true priests of the sanctuary, and because of the reconciling and atoning work of the Mediator annually repeated they are admitted both to the Altar and to the Holy Place, and may perform the worship of God at both alike. This is the conclusion of the writer to the Hebrews after he has finished his exposition of the high priest's work upon the Day of Atonement—*having therefore brethren boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus . . . and having a great priest over the house of God, let us draw near.*⁵ All the sons of Aaron are priests, even as all who *come to the Lord are to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.*⁶

¹ Lev. ix. *passim*.

⁴ Lev. xvi. 17.

² Verses 9, 12, 18.

⁵ Heb. x. 19, 20.

³ Verse 20.

⁶ 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5.

The fact of the matter seems to be that while tabernacle, altar, priesthood, and offerings were the means by which the abiding Presence of God was mediated to the Israelite people, and were therefore necessarily made to agree with the truth of the Person and the Work of the one and only Mediator between God and men, yet at the same time the tabernacle was the place where God, in symbol, dwelt, and therefore the place where, in symbol also, His people served Him. The priest is not only mediator between God and men, he is also appointed to serve God.¹ Indeed it seems that the mediatorial office is by no means essential to the idea of priesthood. We find the essential idea of priesthood rather in the notion of consecration to service. *I have brought you unto Myself*, said Jehovah to Israel. *Now therefore if ye will obey My voice indeed, and keep My covenant, then ye shall be Mine own possession from among all peoples ; for all the earth is Mine ; and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.*² Priesthood then in the sense of consecration to God's service was the common possession of all Israel ; and within the tabernacle precinct the nature and obligations of the service of God were set forth under rites and ceremonies, which far from being "dumb and dark," were eloquent of duty, and shone with the light of the Divine favour and goodness. This must indeed have been one of the main purposes of the whole system of tabernacle worship, not only to show the necessity of a Mediator and of substitutionary offerings in approach to God, but also to illustrate the nature and implications of service of Him. Accordingly we find in each of the four great divisions, as it were, of the whole complex symbol, a picture not only of the work of Christ on our behalf, but also of the service of God to be rendered by ourselves. The two are indeed vitally connected, because part of the work of Christ on our behalf is to render the service which is required from us ; and which we cannot ourselves fulfil, and in this way He becomes our Exemplar as well as our Substitutionary Satisfaction. But though the work accomplished by Him and the service due from us are in this way connected, there is of course a whole region of His work which is peculiar to Himself, and even where we may follow the example which He has set, we fall short of the perfection of His fulfilment.

In the tabernacle then we find not only the Holiest Place into which the high priest alone entered, and which was the

¹ Num. xviii. 7.

² Exod. xix. 4-6.

expression of the Divine Attributes, but we find also the Holy Place where the priests entered daily and fulfilled their service. The twelve loaves upon the table crowned with frankincense, and changed at the end of every working week, were eloquent of the duty of consecration of our daily activities to God. There also shone the light of the lamps upon the golden candlestick, indicative of the moral and spiritual senses of men enlightened by the power of the Holy Spirit of God. There, too, both morning and evening rose the cloud of incense, suggestive to every Israelite of the offering of prayer.¹

At the altar again there were gathered not only the priests engaged in their mediatorial offices, receiving and placing upon the altar the substitutionary offerings or sprinkling their blood in the presence of Jehovah; there also was to be seen the Israelite bringing his gifts of devotion, and *compassing* the altar as he *made the voice of his thanksgiving to be heard*.²

So, too, with the priesthood there was not only the high priest upon whose great work on the Day of Atonement the whole place of the sanctuary and the continuance of its services depended, but there were also the happy company of *his household the servants of Jehovah*³ who stood in the house of Jehovah, and served Him day and night in His temple.

And once more we shall see, when we come to consider the Offerings, that there are not only the four great substitutionary offerings which speak of the Person of the Redeemer and of His work for us; but there is also the non-substitutionary and bloodless meal-offering and drink-offering which symbolize the consecration of our works to God. We shall also see that this offering is always joined with and is identical in idea with the burnt-offering. It is the dedication of ourselves even as He dedicated Himself to the service of God.

On the whole then we conclude that in the office and service of the priests, the sons of Aaron, we are to see a picture of the service due from every Israelite. And in this connection it is important to notice in how many ways it is made clear that the service of the priests in the tabernacle by no means exonerated the Israelites from service, as if, though they were all priests, they could delegate their responsibilities to a few, and then be, as it were, free from obligations; for in the consecration of priests there is nothing corresponding to the delegation of duties which took place at the consecration of the Levites.⁴ To mention only a few of the most important

¹ Ps. cxli. 2.

² *Ib.* xxvi. 6, 7.

³ *Ib.* cxxxiv.

⁴ Num. viii. 18.

provisions which must have tended to impress this fact upon the Israelites—we remember that the silver sockets of the sanctuary and the silver fillets upon the pillars of the court represented the atonement money of all Israel, money which was to be again contributed upon every occasion of numbering the people. Their obligation then towards the sanctuary and to its services was a perpetual obligation and could not be, so to speak, compounded for. But the obligation extended to their persons also. Three times a year every male must present himself at the sanctuary in personal service of God. Upon the birth of every first-born male in his family or in his flocks or herds a further visit of dedication was necessary. While journeying in the wilderness every clean animal slain for food must be offered as a sacrifice of peace-offerings. And even after settlement in Canaan upon every such occasion the blood must be poured out upon the earth, in token that the connection with the daily life of the sanctuary remained unbroken. Ceremonial uncleanness, moreover, which would exclude from the tabernacle court, was to be avoided or removed in daily life. And indeed the presence of priestly cities amongst all the tribes of Israel was not only a reminder but also a token and pledge of the consecration of the whole nation.

The priests then were the picture of a consecrated people, and with this principle to guide us we turn back to the story of their consecration.

There we read that they, like the high priest, were ceremonially washed, were invested with their garments, and were perfected for their service by the threefold offering on their behalf of a sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a sacrifice of peace-offerings. We conclude then that all who are consecrated to the service of God are cleansed from their sins by the blood of Christ, are accepted for the merits of Christ, and enjoy fellowship with God through Christ. They are also clean, bathed by the laver of regeneration, after which it is necessary only to wash hands and feet as the priests did in all their service. Their garments also, though they also differ from those of their High Priest essentially, yet bear a resemblance to what He too possessed. They too, like Him, have linen garments, clean and white; they too have the girdle for glory and for beauty. All God's consecrated ones are *clothed with righteousness*; ¹ they *offer themselves in holy array*,² in their garments of consecration.

¹ Ps. cxxxii. 9.

² *Ib.* cx. 3; xcvi. 9.

But we must notice further that all the priests were admitted formally to priestly functions. The blood of the ram of consecration was placed for them also upon ear and hand and foot; the flesh and cakes were placed upon their hands when being waved before Jehovah; and upon their persons and garments was sprinkled the commingled blood and oil. In this part of the consecration service it does not appear that any distinction is made between Aaron and his sons, whether in the directions as recorded in Exodus or in the actual carrying out of those directions as recorded in Leviticus. They with him¹ are granted the exercise of priestly functions, and apparently of identical functions. We are disposed then to regard this part of the service as conditioned by the necessity that not only Aaron but his sons also should perform the ordinary mediatorial functions in the sanctuary. In other ways it was clearly shown that the true Mediator is one and one only. But it was impossible that all the functions which were symbolic of the Christ could be performed by one individual. Aaron's own sons accordingly are selected as his helpers; so that in a true sense the symbolism does not go outside Aaron at all, and they are admitted to be with him a likeness of the true Priest. When discussing the symbolism of the offerings it will be quite plain that the priest is distinct from the offerer, and is always symbolic of the mediator. It being necessary then, in practice, that this function should be shared by the ordinary priests, it is definitely assigned to them along with Aaron at the rite of their consecration. Meanwhile the annual ceremony of the Day of Atonement, and the fact that after this first day of initiation of Aaron and his sons to the priesthood, no other ordinary priest was consecrated at all, but only each high priest upon his succession to the office, —all this must have kept constantly before the minds of the people the essential difference between the two.

It is scarcely necessary to remind the student of Scripture that the explanation which we have given of the position of the priests in the tabernacle is that which we find in the New Testament. While the High Priest is always spoken of there as the figure of Christ Himself, the language of the Old Testament regarding the priests generally is transferred to those who are in Christ; and now that our Lord Himself has declared that the true worshippers are to worship in spirit and in truth, and no longer in any centralized sanctuary with its

¹ Exod. xxix. 21.

outward forms and ceremonies, we are left with the conviction that what the priests did at the altar and in the temple, other than those services in which they were distinguished from the Israelite worshipper, is symbolic of our own spiritual service and worship in that sphere of life where God has placed us. To those of us who have been *washed and sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God*¹ there comes the call to be *an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession*.² The service of Israel as represented by the priest centred round the daily dedication of the burnt-offering with its meal- and drink-offerings upon the brazen altar, and the perpetual service of the Holy Place, of the significance of which we have already spoken. This ministry we know penetrated as far as the Holiest Place, but just stopped short of entry, *the Holy Ghost thus signifying*, not that the true Israel of God should never enter into His immediate presence, but *that the way into that innermost sanctuary had not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing*.³ But when the great High Priest proclaimed upon the cross that His work of reconciliation was finished, the separating veil was rent from top to bottom, and henceforward all the priests of God have *boldness to enter*⁴ into that Holiest Place, yea to the mercy-seat and *throne of grace*⁵ itself, *by the blood of Jesus*, by the way which He dedicated for us, that is to say, by way of Himself.

It may be remarked in conclusion that Scripture indeed speaks of the body of the Christian as *a temple of the Holy Spirit*,⁶ but it is clear that this is very far from suggesting that there is any analogy between the tabernacle structure and the human frame. Nor can the comparison of created things to a Temple of God⁷ be any authorization for the idea that we are to see in the tabernacle a figure of this creation. Rather do we feel convinced that the principles which we have followed in the discussions of this chapter will be found to give the only consistent account of the whole and of its several parts.

But it must be admitted that there are indications in the New Testament that we are not yet in a position to give a finally exhaustive account of the symbolism of the tabernacle.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians St. Paul speaks of Christians as being *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the chief corner-stone, in*

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 11.

⁵ *Ib.* iv. 16.

² 1 Pet. ii. 9.

⁶ 1 Cor. vi. 19.

³ Heb. ix. 8.

⁴ *Ib.* x. 19.

⁷ Acts vii. 49.

*whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.*¹ There seems to be in these words something more than an adaptation of Old Testament language to present day facts. We can scarcely doubt that the records of the construction of the tabernacle to be a habitation of God, and the slow growth of the Temple of Solomon, each stone prepared and shaped, and silently placed in its appropriate position, were in the mind of St. Paul as he wrote. If so, there is almost a revelation that the present growth of the Church is in preparation for some future revelation of God through it to the world. As in the days when the tabernacle and temple were in building the willing consecration of materials and of service was accepted and used by the Holy Spirit of God; so is it also to-day in the preparation of this Temple of God to be. Is it of this then that the last vision of Holy Scripture assures us, when St. John saw a new heaven and a new earth . . . and saw the holy city new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband . . . and heard a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He shall tabernacle with them, and they shall be His peoples, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God.² It may indeed be so; but of these things which lie in the future, and of any likeness which the earthly tabernacle may bear to the realities of that place where the angels of God see His face in heaven, we do not feel able to speak. The secret things belong to the Lord our God, but the things which are revealed belong to us; and amongst these revealed things we believe it to be certain that the Tabernacle and the Altar, the Priesthood and the Offerings, all converge upon that central theme of prophecy, the testimony of JESUS.

¹ Eph. ii. 20-22.

² Rev. xxi. 1-4.

CHAPTER X.

A FOURFOLD PICTURE.

OUR review of the progress of revelation up to the time when the Sacrificial Law was given, has, we think, substantiated the statement in the first chapter of this book, that its end and goal is the advent of the Son of God. From those earliest beginnings in the Book of the Beginning, we have traced the Hand of Divine Providence in its delineations of the Redemption, the Salvation, and the Covenant which He would accomplish. We have noted the prominence given to a promise of the Presence of God with men. And we have seen how there are grouped around this promise, not word-pictures nor even the record of significant events alone, but a concrete and perennial image of its fulfilment, in a Tabernacle and Priesthood, an Altar and Offerings. The image presents four faces, with a common likeness indeed, but each possessed of special characteristics of its own. And now we find that out of this Tabernacle, and with reference to the duties of this Priesthood at this Altar, there is given the Law of Offerings recorded in the Book of Leviticus, which is to be our special study. We feel once more how close is the agreement of the New Testament writers with the Old Testament purpose, when they point us to this Law of Offerings for an understanding of the work of Christ. If Tabernacle and Altar and Priest are like Him, care must surely be taken that the matter and manner of the offerings is not left to human caprice and natural development, but is carefully regulated so as not to mar the truth of the picture.

We feel ourselves then to be on sure ground when we set out to discover the minutiae of the Law of Offerings with a view to understanding the nature of the work of Christ.

The opening chapters of Leviticus¹ bring before us five kinds of offering, namely, the Burnt-offering, the Meal-offering, the Sacrifice of Peace-offerings, the Sin-offering and the Tresspass-offering. Four only of these were animal offerings, the

¹ Lev. I.-VII.

exception being of course the meal-offering. As regards this offering, it will be shown later that it is strictly an adjunct of the burnt-offering. Thus we meet frequently with the phrase *the burnt-offering and the meal-offering thereof*,¹ as if one belonged to the other. And with the meal-offering must in this respect be joined the drink-offering, though it does not find distinct mention in the earlier chapters of Leviticus. Thus to every burnt-offering its appropriate meal-offering and drink-offering were attached, and conversely these seem never to have been offered except in conjunction with a burnt-offering. In Numbers xv. indeed meal-offerings and drink-offerings are prescribed as necessary accompaniments not only of the burnt-offering, but also of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. It will be seen, however, later that the sacrifice of peace-offerings consisted of two parts, the first part of which is essentially a sacrifice identical in idea with the burnt-offering and called by that name, while the second part is a feast upon the sacrifice. The meal- and drink-offerings of this sacrifice were connected with its first or burnt-offering part. This at least seems to be the ideal of these offerings. In the wilderness fine flour and oil and wine, which formed the chief ingredients of the meal- and drink-offering, would not be so plentiful as to make it possible for these to be adjuncts of every burnt-offering and sacrifice of peace-offerings, and probably on this account no fixed rule is laid down on this point in Leviticus II. The only mention of the drink-offering in Leviticus is in anticipation of entry into the promised land ;² and the law in Numbers xv. is expressly designed for the time when Israel was actually settled in Canaan.³ At the same time a meal- and drink-offering were attached to the daily burnt-offering in the tabernacle from the beginning,⁴ and this fact, together with the rule in Numbers, seems to show that this is their ideal position in the Divine scheme of offerings. It may also be a reason why the law of the meal-offering follows immediately upon that of the burnt-offering in the first chapters of Leviticus.

There were in addition to what has been enumerated above other special offerings, for example of materials for furnishing the feast of the sacrifice of peace-offerings,⁵ gifts of first-fruits,⁶ and others. But the fact remains that, after deducting the essentially parasitical meal-offering, the four animal offerings legislated for in the opening chapters of Leviticus were the only offerings of the kind permitted within the tabernacle enclosure.

¹ E.g. Lev. xxiii. 13.

⁴ Exod. xxix. 38-41.

² *Ib.* 9-13.

⁵ Lev. vii. 12.

³ Num. xv. 1.

⁶ *Ib.* xxiii. 10, 11.

We have already remarked that the traditional forms of animal sacrifice appear to have been two, and two only, namely, the burnt-offering where all was consumed upon the altar, and the sacrifice properly so called, where part was burned upon the altar, and part consumed by the worshipper, to which had lately been given the name of a sacrifice of peace-offerings. To these two, when giving directions for the consecration of Aaron and his sons, God Himself had added a third, to which He gave the name of Sin; now He makes this a permanent type of offering, ever to be known by the same name of Sin, a Sin-offering; and adds to it a fourth, which He terms Trespass, or Guilt, a Trespass-offering. We shall see that the trespass-offering holds a distinct position of its own, and is not a mere variety, as it were, of the sin-offering; though both alike bear reference to special aspects of that one dread reality, Sin. We are left then with a system of four offerings and four only, reached by a process of addition which is manifestly the effect of Divine purpose. We believe that as Tabernacle and Altar, Priest and Offerings, afford a fourfold picture of the Christ, so the development of the last falls into a fourfold division,¹ forming an Old Testament counterpart to the fourfold Gospel of the New Testament.

It is not difficult in a few words to express the distinguishing characteristics of each of the four.

The Burnt-offering is literally the offering that is made to ascend. Its distinguishing feature is the burning of the whole victim upon the altar, so that it is made to ascend in fire and smoke.

The distinctive feature of the Sacrifice of Peace-offerings is the feast upon the sacrificial victim, which followed the offering upon the altar.

The Sin-offering is distinguished by the ritual use of the shed blood, which is here specially developed.

In the Trespass-offering the idea of restitution is illustrated and enforced.

✓ We may then summarize the characteristic differences by saying that the four offerings respectively represent Acceptance, Fellowship, Atonement, and Restitution.

But while each of the four has its distinctive message clearly stamped upon it, it is no less certain that they are bound to-

¹ We cannot forbear calling the reader's attention to a somewhat similar arrangement in another Book of Symbols, the Apocalypse. The structure of St. John's great vision seems to be first a series of seven seals, the last of which consists of seven trumpets; and again of seven (unnumbered) signs, the last of which consists of seven vials.

gether by such common marks of identity as we have seen to exist among the Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Altar. We will now mention some of these marks of identity, in observances which are peculiar to these four, and common to them all.

I. *The same victims are prescribed.* The general command on this point is, *Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, When any man of you offereth an oblation unto Jehovah, ye shall offer your oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock.*¹ In the detailed commands we find that *the herd* comprises both bullocks and heifers, and *the flock* male and female sheep and goats. These were the only animals permitted to be offered in sacrifice to Jehovah. All wild animals and other domestic animals, such as the camel and the ass, are prohibited. With the object, however, of bringing the offering within the means of the poor, doves and pigeons were allowed to take the place of cattle in burnt- and sin-offerings. In the trespass-offering, for reasons to be afterwards discussed, a ram was always prescribed, and in the sacrifice of peace-offerings, where the victim had to furnish an offering on the altar and also a meal for the worshippers, birds were evidently inadmissible. But on the whole we find that the selection of victims is confined to the herd and the flock, and doves and pigeons.

It is very likely that there was a primitive law to this effect. We remember that Abel brought his offering of the firstlings of his flock. In the history of Noah we read that God commanded him to take seven pairs of *every clean beast*, and one pair only of *beasts that are not clean, and of the birds also of the heavens*² seven pairs, that is, probably seven pairs of *every clean bird*,³ the rest being, like the unclean beasts, in single pairs.⁴ We may presume from this account that at the time of Noah there was a custom prescribing certain kinds of beasts and birds for sacrifice, and that this is the reference of the word *clean* in this passage. In the Book of Leviticus we find the words *clean* and *unclean* applied apparently in the sense of fit or unfit for sacrifice; as when the leper is directed to take *two living clean birds* for his ceremony of cleansing;⁵ or when a *beast whereof men offer an oblation unto Jehovah* is contrasted with an *unclean beast, of which they do not offer an oblation.*⁶ In the Book of Deuteronomy also, the list of birds which were to be reckoned unclean for food opens and closes with the

¹ Lev. I. 2.² Gen. VII. 2, 3.³ *Ib.* VIII. 20.⁴ *Ib.* VII. 8, 9.⁵ Lev. XIV. 4.⁶ *Ib.* XXVII. 9, 11.⁷ Deut. XIV. 11, 20.

comprehensive rule of *all clean birds ye may eat*, as much as to say all birds that are fit for sacrifice are also to be reckoned fit for food.

And that this is the true meaning of the word clean in the passage which we are considering seems to be made certain by the statement that *Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah and took of every clean beast and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar.*¹ The history of Noah then affords evidence not only of the existence of a prevalent custom, but of a public acknowledgment of that custom by God Himself, which confirms the probability that it was based upon primitive tradition, if not upon a positive Divine command.

This probability is further strengthened when we pass on to the time of Abraham. Abraham was, as we know from history, the chosen depository of Divine Revelation, or, in Bible words, God chose him to keep the way of Jehovah, to the end that the Promise might be fulfilled through his Seed.² We should expect then to find in him the Noahic tradition, and there is nothing in the records to show that he followed any other practice in sacrifice. Nor are we left to mere negative indications; we have also some positive evidence of the fact. His son was accustomed to see a lamb offered as a burnt-offering;³ and it is remarkable that on one occasion God Himself selected the victims for a sacrificial rite. On the occasion of that momentous vision when Abraham's faith in the Promise was reckoned to him for justification, God's command came to him in the words, *Take me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove and a young pigeon.*⁴ These creatures being taken for the use of Jehovah must be regarded as in a true sense sacrificial victims even though they were not at once consumed upon the altar; and here we find representatives of the flock and of the herd, turtle-doves and pigeons, exactly as in the later directions to Moses. Is it not reasonable to suppose that these were the beasts and birds already known to Noah as clean and recognized as such by Abraham, and that in the Mosaic code God was re-enforcing the primitive practice, sanctioned by Divine precepts, which during the long sojourn in Egypt may have become forgotten or obscured?

If the choice of sacrificial animals was really limited from the beginning or from early times by a Divine command, we should feel bound to seek for some purpose in the restriction. We know as a fact that there was a Divine *charge and command-*

¹ Gen. VIII. 20.² *Ib.* XVIII. 19.³ *Ib.* XXII. 7.⁴ *Ib.* XV. 9.

ments, statutes, and laws,¹ which Abraham was commended for observing. But without assuming what is not definitely stated, that rules for the victims of sacrifice were among these, the existence of such rules in the Law given by Moses is an invitation to us to enquire their reason. This reason, in the light of the fulfilment of the sacrificial system, is not far to seek. The selection of the victims of sacrifice from the flock and the herd is because these domestic animals were most closely associated with men in their daily life; and because men from the earliest times had depended upon them for food and for clothing. If for the purposes of a prophetic picture a substitute for man was to be found amongst the animals, what animals could be more suitable than those who are nearest to man in life and in death? And what could afford a more true, however imperfect, picture than these of the Son of Man Who would give His life a ransom for many? And if, under special circumstances, an extension was permitted to birds of the heaven, the choice must still be confined to those who make their homes with men, the dove and the pigeon.

2. *A common ritual belongs to all.* Under this head we shall only consider two points of ritual, the laying on of hands and the killing of the victims, both actions being performed by the offerer.

THE LAYING ON OF HANDS.

The phrases *to lay the hand* and *to lay the hands* appear to be used interchangeably,² and to refer to the same act; usually it is believed that both hands³ were pressed upon the head of the victim. This ritual act is prescribed distinctly for the burnt-offering,⁴ the sacrifice of peace-offerings,⁵ and the sin-offering.⁶ The ritual for the trespass-offering is not given at length in the same way as that for the other three.⁷ It is simply said that the worshipper shall bring his trespass-offering of a ram to Jehovah, and that *the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram, and he shall be forgiven.* The natural inference is that the ritual (so far as the worshipper is concerned) follows that of the sin-offering which has immediately preceded, and with which the trespass-offering is so closely connected by the ideas of atonement and forgiveness.⁸ So that we may say, without fear of contradiction, that the laying on of the hands of the worshipper is a point of ritual

¹ Gen. xxvi. 5.

² E.g. Num. xxvii. 18, 23.

³ See Lev. xvi. 21.

⁴ *Ib.* i. 4.

⁵ *Ib.* iii. 2.

⁶ *Ib.* iv. 4.

⁷ *Ib.* v. 14-vi. 7.

⁸ See further below on the Trespass Offering.

common to these four offerings. It is also a point of ritual which is peculiar to them, a fact which is of importance in estimating the meaning of this ritual act. It is not then a sufficient account of the laying on of hands to say that it denotes a consecration of the offering to the service of God. If this were the sole significance of the rite, it would be difficult to account for its omission from the ritual of the meal-offering, which is given at length, or from the offering of first-fruits; for these equally with the four were set apart to the service of God. We must then look for some other idea in this special rite.

✓ If we examine the Scripture records we shall find that the underlying idea of the laying on of hands is the idea of *transference*. When Jacob laid his hands upon the head of Ephraim and Manasseh he, as it were, transferred to them the blessings which he had inherited from his fathers. He accompanied the act with the words, *The God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God who hath fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel who hath redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.*¹ This idea, moreover, was attached to the act not only in human conception, but by Divine direction. *Take Joshua the son of Nun, said the Lord to Moses, and lay thy hand upon him, and give him a charge in the sight of all the congregation; and thou shalt put of thine honour upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may obey.*² Moses is directed to transfer his own responsibility and dignity to Joshua by the laying on of his hands. The necessary endowments for the office were also conveyed by the symbolic act, for we read that *Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him.*³ Once again, and also by Divine direction, those who had heard the son of the Israelitish woman blaspheme the Name laid their hands upon his head, after which he suffered the penalty for his sin. The evident significance of the act in this case was the transference of responsibility for the crime from the witnesses to the perpetrator. Until the man had been brought to justice, responsibility rested upon *all that heard him*. Of this they became quit when they pointed out the real transgressor, and laid the guilt as it were upon his head.⁴ Very similar to this

¹ Gen. XLVIII. 15, 16.

² Deut. XXXIV. 9.

³ Num. XXVII. 18-20.

⁴ Lev. XXIV. 14, 15.

are the directions for the Day of Atonement, where the significance of the act is expressed with great distinctness. *Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins, and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, . . . and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land.*¹ Aaron evidently is to transfer the whole responsibility for the sins of those whom he represented to the head of the goat on which his hands were laid. No less clear than this is the remarkable ritual which was observed at the consecration of the Levites.² The Levites by this service were offered *on the behalf of the children of Israel*,³ that it might be theirs to do the service of Jehovah; or, as it is otherwise expressed, they were wholly given to the Lord *instead of all the first-born among the children of Israel*.⁴ And this was symbolized by the children of Israel laying their hands upon the Levites.⁵ The responsibility of the children of Israel, and especially of their first-born, is here transferred to the Levites by the same act of laying on of hands; and the result is that the Levites bear it *on the behalf of or instead of* those who laid hands upon them.

In the light of these passages it is not possible that the meaning of this ceremonial act in the ritual of sacrifice should remain uncertain. By laying his hands upon his oblation the offerer transferred to it his responsibilities before Jehovah. From that time forward it became in a real sense his representative or substitute. Its relationship to him is properly defined as being in behalf of or instead of him. All oblations to which is attached this ceremonial act may then be classed as substitutionary offerings, and all others from which it is absent we may call non-substitutionary. But we have seen that the laying on of hands is common to four and four only of the offerings of the Jews. These four then we take to be true substitutionary offerings, and in this respect designed in the likeness of Him of whom it is written that He suffered for our sins, *the righteous on behalf of the unrighteous*,⁶ and that He came to give His life *a ransom instead of many*.⁷

¹ Lev. xvi. 21, 22.² Num. viii. 5-19.³ Verse 11.⁴ Verses 16, 18.⁵ Verse 10.⁶ 1 Pet. iii. 18. *δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων.*⁷ Matt. xx. 28. *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.*

THE KILLING OF THE VICTIM.

It is obvious that the killing of the victim is not simply the necessary preliminary to its being burned upon the altar, but is rather an integral and a prominent part of the symbolism, for it finds distinct mention in the ritual of each kind of offering. Of the burnt-offering we read that the offerer *shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him; and he shall kill the bullock before Jehovah.*¹ Of the sacrifice of peace-offerings it is said *he shall lay his hand upon the head of his oblation and kill it.*² And of the sin-offering, with which in this respect the trespass-offering quite obviously agreed,³ the rule is *he shall lay his hand upon the head of the bullock, and kill the bullock before Jehovah.*⁴ The killing of the victim by the hand of the offerer himself is, then, in each case the immediate sequel of the transference of his responsibility to its head. We take it for granted that the death of the victim is in idea a penal death, because the victim is here standing in the place of the man as his substitute, and the consistent witness of Scripture from cover to cover is that death in man is the penal consequence of his sin. We shall return to this point later, and illustrate it more fully from Scripture, but at this point we do no more than assume that this is the true significance of the killing of the victim. It is surely of the deepest significance that the immediate consequence of bearing the responsibility of a man in the presence of Jehovah is the suffering of penal death. Nor must we overlook the fact that it is the offerer himself who deals the fatal blow; as much as to say that the penal responsibilities of man have been brought upon him by his own act. From one point of view it is the moral government of God that exacts the punishment of sin, and we shall see that this truth is emphasized in the ritual use of the shed blood of the victim. But from another point of view the death of a sinner is self-inflicted, or at least we must say that death in the race is so. It was the decree of God, not arbitrarily we may feel sure, but from inward necessities in His moral government of created responsible beings, that when our first parents were guilty of disobedience they should surely die. But it was their own disobedience that brought death upon them, and also, as a consequence, upon any person to whom their responsibilities might in future be transferred. The Bearer of our responsibility must perforce expose Himself to

¹ Lev. i. 4, 5.² Ib. iii. 2.³ See Ib. vii. 2.⁴ Ib. iv. 4.

penal death. This is an immutable fact which finds its necessity, as we believe, in the very nature of God, and in His relationship to created things. To this great reality the symbolism of the substitutionary offerings must be adapted; and this is the reason why the offerer was directed to kill the animal immediately after transferring his responsibility to it. The act must have conveyed a salutary lesson to the dullest Israelite mind, while to the more spiritual it must have contributed largely towards that sense of sin which is the peculiar possession of the people whom God instructed, and which must be experienced in some real degree at least by every one who receives the Gospel of the Saviour to the salvation of his soul. We have seen in earlier chapters of this book how the truth that Christ must die had been continually adumbrated from the time of that earliest promise which spoke of His being bruised. The first symbol of restoration showed also the flame of a sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life.¹ The great redemption was under the shelter of the blood of death.² And now the elaborate picture-prophecy of His work carries in its very front His dying. And so the Gospel of St. Paul is as he claims it to be the Gospel of all the Scriptures, *I delivered unto you first of all that Christ died for our sins.*³

3. *A common object is assigned to all.* A third mark of identity of reference in the four offerings is that they are all offered with the object of making atonement. At the occasion of the first regulation of these sacrifices, we read of the burnt-offering that *it shall be accepted for the offerer to make atonement for him.*⁴ The sacrifice of peace-offerings also was *accepted and imputed to him that offered it,*⁵ with the result that he enjoyed fellowship with God. In the trespass-offering also it is distinctly stated once and again that the priest made atonement with the ram which was offered;⁶ while in the sin-offering, where the full emphasis of the ritual lies upon the death of the victim, the object of atonement finds constant expression.⁷ In strict accordance with what was said of them at the institution of the tabernacle service, we find constant reference to atonement being made as the result of the burnt-offering and the sin- and trespass-offerings in later Scriptures. It is true that the word does not appear to be directly used in reference to the sacrifice of peace-offerings, but the reason is, no doubt, that this sacrifice contained elements of both the

¹ Gen. III. 24.² Exod. XII. 22, 23.³ I Cor. xv. 3.⁴ Lev. I. 4.⁵ *Ib.* VII. 18.⁶ *Ib.* V. 16.⁷ *Ib.* IV. and v. *passim*.

sin- and the burnt-offerings, and that what was said of them would be understood as applicable to that which was common to them in it, while that which was peculiar to the sacrifice of peace-offerings, namely, the feast upon the offered victim, was in no way concerned in the making of atonement. The atonement was first made through the offering upon the altar, so that the man thus accepted and atoned for might sit down in fellowship with God at His board. It is, then, strictly correct to say that the object in bringing the sacrifice of peace-offerings to the altar was to make atonement for the offerer, as in the case of the other three offerings.

It is expressly stated that the atoning element in these sacrifices is the blood. *The life of the flesh is in the blood ; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls ; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life.*¹ The Hebrew word for *to make atonement* is *caphar*, a word which is used first in Genesis for *pitching* the ark within and without with pitch.² It is supposed originally to have had the meaning *to cover* or *to shelter*, and the idea of the word in its sacrificial connections is that of covering so as to hide, or to treat as non-existent.³ We notice then that it is the blood of killing which can cover up and render invisible to the eye, or non-existent to the sense, that which needs atonement. This is in fact the invariable language of Scripture, the few apparent exceptions in the Old Testament not being really such when carefully examined. To these apparent exceptions we must, however, briefly refer, so that we may be quite sure of our ground in this important matter. It cannot be unimportant that we should understand what part of the work of Christ avails for the atonement of sins. So far it has appeared that it is the element of the killing of the victim which is common to these four sacrifices, which accounts for their common value in effecting atonement. But is there any further revelation in the Old Testament Scriptures which may weaken or modify this conclusion?

In the Book of Numbers we read that Aaron on one occasion made atonement by the burning of incense.⁴ But it is significant that he took the fire for his censer from the altar. The crisis was sudden and special, it was no time for ritual service ; but the intercession of Aaron on behalf of the sinful people was then, as always, linked with the ceremonial of the altar-offerings. This then we regard as no exception at all

¹ Lev. xvii. 11.

³ In Is, xxviii. 18 *annulled* is *caphar*.

² Gen. vi. 14.

⁴ Num. xvi. 46.

to the principle that atonement was always made by the blood of sacrificial death. We may compare with this the vision which Isaiah saw, apparently within the Temple.¹ There a live coal from off the altar touched his lips, so that his iniquity was taken away and his sin atoned for.² We cannot conceive that in this heavenly vision there would be seen an actual sacrifice to remove the guilt from the trembling prophet, conscious of his own uncleanness. But the expiation comes from the altar, and whether the reference be to the altar of burnt-offering or to the altar of incense, the significance will be the same; for in the Temple ritual whatever fire stood in the censer upon the golden altar had been brought from the altar of burnt-offering without. We are again led to the altar, with its sacrificed victims, as the source of atonement.

We have already noticed in a former chapter the *ransom*³ for his soul which each Israelite was directed to pay when a numbering of the people took place.⁴ This money payment is twice spoken of as *making atonement for the souls* of the people, and is called *the atonement money*. It was directed to be used *for the service of the tent of meeting, that it may be a memorial for the children of Israel before Jehovah, to make atonement for your souls*. This seems on first sight to be a clear instance of atonement made by money payment, and without the shedding of blood. But a little consideration will show that it is not really so. There can be no doubt that it is the sacrificial service rendered by the priests, which is the subject of the paragraphs which immediately precede as it is of those which follow this passage,⁵ by which alone atonement is made. That service was rendered upon the two altars, one without and one within the tent of meeting; and of the latter it has just been expressly stated that with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement, atonement should be made upon it once a year,⁶ namely, on the great day of atonement. The service of the tent of meeting then is the service by which atonement is made, and towards the up-keep of this service every Israelite was to pay his share, as a ransom for the atonement of his soul. We have already interpreted this as indicating that the atonement made by the priests was no mere *opus operatum*, but required from each individual a personal act of alliance with what was being done before it became effectual for his benefit. The neglect to do this, on the other hand, excluded him from the reconciling service, and left him

¹ Is. vi.² Heb. *caphar*.³ Heb. *copher*.⁴ Exod. xxx. 11-16.⁵ *Ib.* xxix. 38-xxx. 10; and xxx. 17-21.⁶ *Ib.* 9.

exposed to the stroke of Divine anger.¹ The ordinance is therefore no exception to the rule that atonement is made through blood-shedding alone. It is simply an arrangement calculated to remind the Israelite worshipper that he had a personal responsibility in the matter of his reconciliation with God; and agreeable to the truth of the Gospel that we are saved by faith. As Abraham's faith was reckoned to him for righteousness, and David's faith freed him from the imputation of guilt, so also the Israelite payment to the service of the tent of meeting made atonement for his soul. We believe that it was the recollection of this ordinance which moved the Israelite army on their return from that victorious expedition against Midian, recorded in the Book of Numbers. The officers upon taking the sum of the men of war under their charge found that there was not a single man missing. They at once determined to bring *an oblation to Jehovah to make atonement for their souls*, in imitation of the oblation of half a shekel required from every Israelite when the people were numbered. They had experienced signal deliverance in having concluded the expedition without loss, and they wished to express their sense of the mercies received; they did it accordingly in this way, and used the language of the original ordinance in doing so. The oblation being made to Jehovah was evidently intended for the service of the tent of meeting, and the act was a clear acknowledgment of the benefit of that service to themselves. It was therefore received by Moses and Eleazar the priest in the spirit in which it was offered, and applied to the uses of the tent of meeting. But it is perhaps significant that Moses, whom we take to be the historian, does not endorse the statement that it made atonement for their souls, but simply speaks of it as being *for a memorial for the children of Israel before Jehovah*. However this may be, it is quite clear that the oblation was given in acknowledgment of blessings already received, and not for the purpose of expiating guilt; the incident therefore is in no sense antagonistic to the rule that atonement is effected only through blood-shedding.

In the Book of Proverbs we find a statement which must be considered, occurring as it does in a book which we believe to have the imprimatur of the Holy Spirit. It is there said² that *by mercy and truth iniquity is atoned for; and by the fear of Jehovah men depart from evil*. Does this open up a new or additional way of atonement, and if not, in what sense are we to understand the words? We believe that the

¹ Exod. xxx. 12.

² Prov. xvi. 6.

words are capable and indeed invite an explanation entirely agreeable with the teaching of the sacrificial law. As we consider that law in detail we shall find continual illustration of the truth that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. It is as much a necessary condition to the forgiveness of sins that a man should tread the path of mercy and truth as that he should exercise faith in the appointed means of atonement. Since the days of Cain and Abel this principle of sacrifice has obtained, *If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door.* It is expressed in the language of symbol by this ordinance of the burnt-offering, *When thou preparest a bullock for a burnt-offering, then shall he offer with the bullock a meal-offering for an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Jehovah.*² And the converse is expressed in the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. *The soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, having his (ceremonial) uncleanness upon him, shall be cut off from his people.*³ The statement that *the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to Jehovah,*⁴ or that of David that God delighted in the *sacrifices of righteousness,*⁵ are but the interpretation of this symbolic language. There never has been any atonement outside the pathway of mercy and truth, but it is ever ready for the man who turns into and abides in that way. The fear of Jehovah can only consist with departing from evil. *If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin.*⁶ The message to all sinners is, Repent ye and believe the Gospel, and by repentance no less than by faith iniquity is atoned for; not as being the meriting cause, but, in the very nature of things, as the necessary condition of being in a state of pardon and of peace with God. There is no peace, saith my God, unto the wicked. According to the ceremonial law, therefore, in strict accordance with these eternal realities, apart from shedding of blood there is no remission, but the man who comes to take shelter under the covering of the shed blood must walk in the paths of mercy and truth, and by the fear of the Lord depart from evil.

We have now considered some marks of identity which show how truly these four sacrifices are moulded in one likeness, the Figure of One Who becomes close to us in nature; Who takes upon Himself our whole obligation; Who in doing so surrenders His life; and by that act procures for us the par-

¹ Gen. iv. 7.² Num. xv. 8-10.³ Lev. vii. 20.⁴ Prov. xv. 8; xxi. 27.⁵ Ps. li. 19.⁶ 1 John. i. 7.

don of our sins, and the acceptance of our persons and of our service before Jehovah. *Behold, the Son of God.* But if this is so, then the characteristic differences in the four must be designed to bring into prominence this or that feature of the whole great work. Nothing less than a fourfold representation was considered sufficient to give an adequate idea of that many-sided thought of God when He was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; just as we find that in the providence of God a fourfold record has been vouchsafed to us of its fulfilment.

Before we pass to a detailed examination of the four substitutionary offerings, there are some points relating to them in common which still demand attention. These will form the subject of the rest of this chapter.

✓ 1. The offering was in each case to be provided by the offerer himself,¹ and apparently from his own herd or flock. It is, however, clear that this latter condition could not always be fulfilled, and in a later regulation there is mention of turning tithes and firstlings into money, taking the money to the place which God would choose, and there expending it in the requisites for sacrifice.² This, no doubt, was the origin of the custom in the second temple in the time of our Lord, where worshippers bought their sacrifices on the spot. Probably a similar custom prevailed in the first temple,³ and *the flock of holy things, the flock of Jerusalem in her appointed feasts*, of which Ezekiel speaks,⁴ may refer to flocks prepared for the convenience of worshippers at the feasts. It is clear, however, from the words of Malachi that at his time it was still customary for the offerer to select an animal from his own flock,⁵ and this we may believe to have been the original practice. But whether from his own herd or flock, or purchased elsewhere, the animal destined for sacrifice was to be procured by the offerer himself—even though another might share in the expense⁶—and to be brought by himself to the place which God appointed. At first sight it may seem as if this rule conflicted with the interpretation which has been given of these sacrifices. If they were intended to be like the sacrifice of the Son of God, why was the offerer himself to procure them? Is it not the certain truth that we had nothing to do with procuring that Holy Victim who stands as our Substitute and Representative, and that His provision must be ascribed to the independent volition and spontaneous action of God Himself?

¹ Cf. Lev. xvi. 3, 5.

² Deut. xiv. 22-27.

³ 2 Kings xii. 16.

⁴ Ezek. xxxvi. 38.

⁵ Mal. i. 14.

⁶ Acts xxi. 23, 24.

This is indeed the truth, and it is not likely to be lost sight of in any part of the ritual of these offerings. But it is not difficult to show that the provision of the victim by the offerer does not destroy its likeness to the Son of God. In the first place it is obvious, if sacrificial worship was to be at all generally rendered by the people, that the sacrificial victims must be provided by the people themselves. It is difficult to suggest any other rule which would be less open to objection than the rule that each worshipper should provide and present his own victim. The fact that God would provide the true victim had been once for all stamped upon the sacrificial symbolism upon Mount Moriah,¹ and the memory of it enshrined in the records of Israel for all time. But this miracle of provision could not be perpetually repeated, and since a victim must somehow be procured, the actual rule seems to be the most simple and practical which could be devised.

There is more, however, to be said than this. We cannot forget that Moses must have known, and every spiritually minded Israelite also, that the blood of bulls and of goats could not really atone for sins, nor a beast take the place and bear the responsibilities of a man. All that was asked of him here was, not to procure his own substitute and representative, but to provide the material for a picture of his atonement. The direction is then strictly parallel to the invitation to Israel to bring the necessary materials for making the tabernacle. Every spiritual Israelite knew that no man could prepare a dwelling-place for God.² But Israel was not summoned actually to devise a dwelling-place for God. Everything to the smallest detail was prescribed by God Himself. So here the Israelite is not called upon to find a representative for himself; he is directed to bring those living creatures which God prescribes. It is still the Lord who provides and man who uses. If we consider this regulation for sacrificial worship carefully, it is indeed in profoundest harmony and closest connection with all that had previously been made known upon this subject. The Israelite had heard that it was Jehovah God who made coats of skins for Adam and his wife, and who clothed them with the skins. He had read or heard in the records of his nation that history to which we have already referred, of how God provided the lamb for Abraham, and that the nearest and dearest, the noblest and highest which man could offer, *his son, his only son, whom he loved*, must not

¹ Gen. xxii.² 1 Kings viii. 27.

take its place. And now the rule for himself is, in spirit, identical. On Moriah, on that memorable occasion, the Lord provided and showed to Abraham the ram, but Abraham *went and took* him. So here the Lord shows to the Israelite what he may offer for acceptance, not a ram caught in a thicket by his horns, but certain specified animals of his flock and herd, and bids him *go and take* these, and offer them, so that he too like Abraham may be blessed. It is the perpetually recurring and always necessary lesson of individual faith and personal application to God. The very earliest record of sacrificial worship by man bears this lesson stamped upon it. We may safely assume that Adam as head of the family offered sacrifice. But Abel himself brought his offering in the appointed way to Jehovah, and his act of personal faith received special recognition, *Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his offering*. This is, as we know, in strict correspondence with the open revelation of the eternal plan. If God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, He has also ordained that the message of reconciliation shall be proclaimed throughout the world for the *obedience of faith*.¹ It may seem strange in this connection that there is no direction to the Israelite to pray as he laid hands upon his offering. It is possible that such prayer would be an understood thing as necessarily accompanying the rite. Confession is commanded in certain forms of sin-offering,² in the trespass-offering,³ and on the great Day of Atonement.⁴ A special thanksgiving is directed in connection with the offering of firstfruits.⁵ We read that Abraham and Isaac when they built altars *called upon the name of Jehovah*.⁶ So Hannah continued praying before Jehovah after the sacrifice was finished and the sacrificial meal concluded.⁷ And we may perhaps add to these notices the striking expression in Ps. LXVI. 15, *I will offer unto Thee burnt-offerings of fatlings, with the incense of rams*. In view of the well-known symbolism of incense, the phrase *the incense of rams* may well be taken to point to an invariable custom of prayer when offering sacrifice.⁸ We think then that, according to primitive custom, sacrificial worship was ordinarily accompanied by prayer, and that the general recognition of this fact may account for its not being mentioned here. But an additional reason may be that the sacrificial ritual is not primarily

¹ 2 Cor. v. 18-20; Rom. i. 5.

² Num. v. 7.

⁴ Lev. xvi. 21.

² Lev. v. 5.

⁵ Deut. xxvi. 5.

⁶ Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxvi. 25.

⁷ 1 Sam. i. 9-12.

⁸ *Incense* may, however, be only a synonym for *sweet savour*, though to the writer the explanation given above seems preferable.

intended as a rule for divine service. It is much more an acted prophecy, showing forth spiritual truths and pointing to a great reality at the time existing and thereafter to be manifested. The law of the fourfold sacrifice was primarily a prophetic picture of the need and the fact and the way of reconciliation, and only secondarily concerned with the spiritual service of the worshipper. Of his service of prayer there was indeed some notice taken in the symbolism, notably in the use of frankincense in the meal-offering, that invariable adjunct of his offerings of sweet savour. But it is not certain that frankincense was present in every form of meal-offering, so that even this is an indication that the idea is subsidiary and not primary in the Divine scheme. But on this we do not here enlarge further. The point of immediate importance is that, whether accompanied by articulate prayer or not, the presentation of the sacrifice by the individual was intended to lead men to personal appeal to God, and to individual acts of faith, such as that which Jacob expressed when he said, *I have waited for Thy salvation, O Jehovah.*¹ The necessity for such personal application to God and faith in Him is a part of the revealed mystery of the Gospel, and is a prominent feature in its message. We find accordingly here as always that the sacrificial law contains a provision which emphasizes the same principle.

While, however, we notice the need of personal faith and of individual approach to God, which both under the Old Testament and the New is the one way of salvation set before men for their obedience, it is important to recognize the presence of some other facts in the Old Testament symbolism, which evidently answer to certain other realities of the Gospel. We remember that the sacrifice offered by Noah as the new head of the human race was accepted on the behalf of that race.² We remember also the example of Job who offered burnt-offerings for his sons, continually reminding them of their need of sanctification and pleading for them before God.³ We may even bring into this picture the act of the foreign king Darius, who directed that all that is necessary should be supplied to the priests, *that they may offer sacrifices of sweet savour unto the God of Heaven, and pray for the life of the king and of his sons.*⁴ It is evident that the acceptance of Noah's sacrifice on behalf of generations yet unborn is intimated by God Himself. We may surely gather that Job's pious

¹ Gen. XLIX. 18.² *Ib.* VIII. 20-22.³ Job I. 5.⁴ Ezra VI. 10.

action is recorded with approbation by the prophetic author of that book. And as regards the decree of Darius, although it may indeed have been prompted by heathen notions, which seem to come out more strongly in the later decree of Artaxerxes,¹ which regards the sacrifices merely as deprecating wrath, still it is not without significance, occurring where it does in Holy Writ. On the whole, then, in the record of the sacrifice of Noah we may find a true likeness, and we believe an intentional likeness to the true Head of a New Race, offering sacrifice for a world yet unconscious of Him, but with resulting blessing to that world. And in the act of Job, evidently approved and accepted by God, may we not see a picture of Him Who never fails to pray for His own and to plead for them the Sacrifice which He offers on their behalf, even though sometimes they may be thoughtless and careless? And even in the decree of the Persian kings there may lie an unconscious testimony, as much as to say that in every nation he who fears God and works righteousness will be accepted because of the sacrifice offered in the appointed place by the priest of the God of Heaven. In the New Testament we find the facts to which these few and scattered intimations refer. The Lord Himself spoke one parable to teach us that many who through ignorance of His person have never had the opportunity of individual faith in Christ, shall yet enter into life eternal.² At the very close of the Divine revelation we read also of the great white throne, and of the universal judgment, and of the book of life, and of many names written there.³ Now we can scarcely take this book of life to be other than *the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain*,⁴ in which the names of Christian believers are written;⁵ and so we are led to the conclusion that every individual who shall finally escape the lake of fire and enter into the life everlasting will do so because of his share in the merits of the sacrifice of the Lamb who was slain. When we turn back from these thoughts to the Sacrificial Law of Moses, we find the same truth imaged there; faintly imaged, indeed, even as the truth itself is but faintly revealed, yet in true correspondence with the reality. According to the ideal of the law the whole life of the nation depended upon the annual work of atonement, wrought by the high-priest whom God appointed, and upon the daily vicarious service of the tabernacle, and specially thereupon the continual burnt-offerings by whose fires even the daily incense was made to ascend.

¹ Ezra vii. 23.⁴ *Ib.* xiii. 8.² Matt. xxv. 35-40.⁵ *Ib.* iii. 5.³ Rev. xx, i-i5.

The people, meanwhile, went about their tasks and lived out their lives, often unconscious of, but always dependent upon, the work of another. And this work of the priests, which was immediately for the chosen nation, held also a hope for the larger world outside. The blessing of Abraham, it had been plainly predicted, was for all nations of the world. He had been chosen to keep the way of Jehovah in order that this promise might be fulfilled. And so, during the days of waiting, and until the seed should come to whom the promise was made; while the nation still occupied a special position among all the nations of the earth, which equally with them belonged to God—during these days the door of the tent of meeting stood open wide to every stranger who was willing to adopt the seal of the covenant, and to draw near to God by the gate of sacrifice. The work of atonement then which went forward within the tabernacle was not for Israel alone but for the world.¹

So then while Israelites were bidden in unmistakable language to believe in their hearts and confess by their actions the appointed way of salvation, each by often repeated acts of individual approach, yet they were also assured that no bounds might be set to the efficacy of that work which was wrought out by the priest of the God of Heaven in His sanctuary. And this is a true likeness to the facts of the work of Christ.

2. A question arises whether these four offerings represent in any sense the personal service of the offerer. We have seen that the offerer provided the victim, laid his hands upon it, and killed it. From this point in the ritual of sacrifice onwards the whole work passes out of the offerer's hands. The succeeding ceremonial is shared between the priest and the offering, and the offerer appears only as an onlooker or as a recipient. This statement will be verified in detail as we proceed to examine the ritual of each kind of sacrifice, we here only state the fact. We have explained the offerer's part as a transference of his responsibilities to the head of a substitute, a transference which at once involves it in the loss of life. Whatever more is done by or with the offering is done by another hand than that of the offerer. If this is a correct interpretation of the ritual, it presents a true likeness to the real atonement. For according to the teaching of the Gospel, the part of men is to transfer their whole responsibility to the head of their Representative. He undertakes thenceforward not only the penalty of their sin, but all else which is necessary to bring them near to God. It is also a known fact of

¹ John xi. 52.

the Gospel that His whole work for men, whether of incarnation, or of obedience, or of dying, or of rising again, or of ascension into heaven, or of appearance at the right hand of God for us, is always the act of His own volition. In the likeness of these realities, therefore, when the work has once passed out of the hands of the offerer to the victim, and when the victim has presented a true likeness of our Representative by the surrender of its life and has in the act become an inanimate corpse, it is obvious that some other agent must be introduced who by his conscious and voluntary actions can supply that which is now found wanting in the similitude. This agency is supplied by the priest, who has been already made in the likeness of the Son of God. Thenceforward priest and offering combine to do all which is necessary to bring the offerer to a meeting with God, and in their combination present a true likeness to the eternal verities. This will be further illustrated as we examine the ritual in detail; we do no more at present than call attention to the fact. The main point at present is that the ritual of the four offerings, if our interpretation is correct, does not represent the service of the offerer at all, but only the service rendered by another on his behalf. But is there no sense then in which they may be taken to represent the service of the offerer? We believe that the only sense in which this can be said is that they represent *what is due from the offerer to God*. The substitute for men undertakes to satisfy God's requirements from men. The first of these requirements, men being what they are, is penal death, and this penalty the substitute pays. But this is not what God originally required of men, nor is it that in which God takes pleasure; so that this part of the work of the substitute is never spoken of as *a sweet savour* and pleasing to the Lord. We have also noticed that the truth is emphasized that it is a penalty which man has brought upon himself; but at the same time it is a penalty which God demands from men, and therefore the substitute pays it in full. The second requirement is righteousness, to love the Lord his God with all his heart and soul and mind and strength, and to love his neighbour as himself. This is the sweet savour of whole-hearted consecration, originally demanded by God from man, which is truly acceptable and pleasing in His sight. This, too, the substitute renders in the figure by a whole burnt-offering, and in the reality by a consecrated life. Now these are the requirements which God demands from men, but which can only be satisfied by the work of another. In this sense then,

and in this sense only, the ritual of the four offerings can be said to represent the service of men, namely that they set forth plainly what God requires from men for their acceptance in His presence.

But it will be remembered that the meal- and drink-offering is attached to the sacrifice of burnt-offering, and it will be seen that in this is to be found the symbol of the personal service of the worshipper. From all that which symbolizes the work of reconciliation of his substitute his own actions are then expressly excluded, but a special symbol is provided to illustrate the true place of those actions in the Divine scheme of salvation. The meal- and the drink-offering, as we shall see, are invariably attached to the burnt-offering. The burnt-offering represents the perfect service rendered by their Substitute, and the symbol of their own service is indissolubly united with it. But while the two are united, they are never identified or confused, but on the contrary are carefully distinguished. We feel that the likeness is again exact to the truth of the gospel, that the offering of our good works, though it follows and depends upon our acceptance with God, still has no part in the meriting cause of that acceptance. Our good works also are a sweet savour, and pleasing to God, but they are not that sweet savour which procures our acceptance.

3. As we examine the details of the sacrificial ritual, we shall everywhere find evidences of divine workmanship. In Nature the more minute our examination the more perfect the work of God is seen to be. His power and wisdom are shown in the, to our minds, infinitely little, sometimes more convincingly even than in the infinitely great. And we shall find in the minute details of this Law the same perfect workmanship which we find in God's works in Nature. Indeed we may be led at times to think that we have here an ideal system made like the archetypal idea of the Son of God in His redeeming work, which it would be impossible to carry out in practice. It is not at all unlikely that this is really the case, and that it may account in some measure for the failure of the Israelites fully to carry out the ceremonial law, as well as for various modifications which were introduced from time to time, accommodations as it were of the ideal to the practical. The same may be said of some other sacrificial or festal regulations given through Moses. Whatever modifications might be allowed in practice, however, the ideal remained with its permanent witness, and it is to this ideal law which we must turn to learn our lessons of the Son of God.

But this is not to say that the laws were never intended to be put in practice, which is obviously not the case. And, indeed, we may meet with certain ritual directions which are purely for practical utility and convenience, and which have no symbolic meaning. If such really exist, we may be quite sure that their purely practical purpose will be at once evident. It is far more likely that every ritual direction which has been preserved to us in Holy Writ has its proper symbolic intention; and it will be our duty and delight, so far as we are able, to overlook nothing which may bear some message about Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

4. One word more remains to be said about the method of our enquiry. We shall see, as soon as we begin our investigation, that under three at least of the four offerings there are several alternative forms. For example under the burnt-offering, a bullock, a sheep, a goat, or a bird might be offered, and similar alternatives occur under the others. The reason for providing alternative offerings was not always the same. Sometimes they were designed to bring the sacrifice within the means of everyone,¹ and of this provision for the poor the Mother of our Lord took advantage. At other times they were graded according to the position of the offerer.² Moreover, in each class the ritual for the lesser offerings is somewhat curtailed, so that for a complete view of the ritual of any one class it will be necessary to consider the chief offering under that class. This, then, will be our method in the chapters that follow. Under each class of the Four Offerings we shall consider the ritual prescribed for its chief offering. But it will be seen that although the ritual of the lesser sacrifices under each class is curtailed, yet in the most curtailed form of ritual the ruling idea of the class is never lost sight of, but is still emphasized. For example in the burnt-offering the ideas of purity and totality are always present; in the sacrifice of peace-offerings the feast which follows the sacrifice is never forgotten; in the sin-offering the thought of life surrendered, and in the trespass-offering that of satisfaction and amends are unfailingly emphasized.

We are now in a position to enter upon the detailed examination of the Fourfold Picture; and in the next chapter we shall commence with the burnt-offering.

¹ E.g. Lev. v. 7; xiv. 21.

² *Ib.* iv. 3, 13, 22, 27.

CHAPTER XI.

THE BURNT-OFFERING OR ACCEPTANCE.

THE chief passages which treat of the law of burnt-offerings are as follows:—

Lev. I. ; addressed to the children of Israel.

Lev. VI. 8-13 ; addressed to Aaron and his sons.

Lev. VII. 8 ; the portion of the officiating priest.

Lev. XXII. 17-20 ; concerning the victims, addressed to Aaron and to his sons, and to all the children of Israel.

Num. XV. 1-16 ; the law of accompanying meal- and drink-offerings, to be observed when the children of Israel had come into the land of their habitations.

THE NAME.

We shall commence our study of each kind of offering with a short account of the name by which it is distinguished ; and in doing so we gladly acknowledge the great debt we owe to a most valuable book, *Synonyms of the Old Testament*, by Canon Girdlestone. All quotations which are made in these short notes at the commencement of each chapter, unless otherwise stated, are taken from this book.

The Hebrew word which is translated burnt-offering is '*Olah*, a noun derived from the verb '*Alah*, which means *to go up, to ascend*. The offering bears this name because it was seen to ascend in smoke and vapour by being wholly burned upon the altar. "The best rendering of the word would be *an ascending offering*." We find the name applied in Scripture first to the offerings of Noah ;¹ it occurs several times in the account of the offering up of Isaac, and indeed it is the term which God Himself uses in His direction to Abraham ;² it is twice mentioned in the Book of Job, one occasion being again in the mouth of God ;³ we find it also in the words of

¹ Gen. VIII. 20.

² *Ib.* XXII. 2.

³ Job I. 5 ; XLII. 8.

Moses to Pharaoh,¹ and in the story of Jethro's visit to Moses.² Immediately after the proclamation of the Ten Commandments, and of the ordinances of the Covenant upon Mount Sinai, we read also of young men of the children of Israel offering burnt-offerings under the mount.³ These are all the notices of the 'Olah in Scripture before its regulation by God through Moses. The Greek translators render the word by *όλοκαύτωμα* or *όλοκαύτωσις*, i.e. that which is wholly burnt.

There is another Hebrew word which is used to describe this offering, and that is *Calil*, denoting *that which is complete*. This word occurs four times as applied to the burnt-offering,⁴ and once as applied to the meal-offering of the priest,⁵ which, unlike the ordinary meal-offering, was completely turned into smoke upon the altar. It is the adjective which describes the robe of the ephod and the covering of the ark as being *all* of blue; it is also used of the *perfection* of beauty,⁶ and of the complete passing away of idols;⁷ and when referring to offerings is usually translated *whole-burnt-offering*. In Ps. LI. 19 the two words '*olah* and *calil* occur together.

It is worthy of remark that in Ezra VIII. 35 '*olah* is used in a sense which covers the sin-offering. This is no doubt because in all four forms of sacrifice a part at least of the animal was caused to ascend by burning. But the word is usually restricted to that form of sacrifice in which burning upon the altar is the chief feature. And it is interesting to note in this connection what has been already referred to, that the word invariably used for burning upon the altar is *kathar*, which denotes the turning into smoke or vapour. There is a passage in Chronicles⁸ which illustrates well the use of the word, where it is said that *Aaron and his sons offered upon the altar of burnt-offering, and upon the altar of incense*. The verb here translated *offered* is *kathar*, and the statement is that on both altars Aaron and his sons turned into vapour and smoke the fat and flesh of animals or the substance of incense. *Kathar* in fact often means simply *to-burn-incense*.⁹ An entirely different word is used for burning where the object is only to do away with what is burned. On the whole then we may gather from the names applied to this offering that it denotes something which is made to ascend towards God in the heavens.

¹ Exod. x. 25.² *Ib.* xviii. 12.³ *Ib.* xxiv. 5.⁴ Lev. vi. 22; Deut. xxxiii. 10; 1 Sam. vii. 9; Ps. li. 19.⁵ *Ib.* vi. 23.⁶ Lam. ii. 15; Ezek. xvi. 14, etc.⁷ Is. ii. 18.⁸ 1 Chron. vi. 49.⁹ E.g. Exod. xxx. 7 and *passim*.

We have seen that the burnt-offering existed long before Moses, and from the comparative frequency of mention of the *'olah* we may perhaps conclude that, at least in the line of the promised seed, it embodied the most prevalent ideas of sacrifice. This may also be the reason why it stands first in the Book of Leviticus. The form of its introduction also in that place indicates that it was already well known. There is first the general introduction to the law of offerings; *When any man of you offereth an oblation unto Jehovah*, and then the particularization of each form the oblation might take, beginning with, *If his oblation be a burnt-offering*. But before we commence our study of this particular form of oblation there are two points which call for special consideration.

The first point is that this law of burnt-offerings is stated to have been the subject of a Divine oracle. *Jehovah called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tent of meeting*. The present oracle extends as far as the end of the third chapter, and includes laws for the burnt-offering, the meal-offering, and the sacrifice of peace-offerings. This oracle was no doubt given by a Voice which came from above the mercy-seat,¹ and to which Moses listened, standing either within the tent in its open entrance, or it may be within the holy place and in front of the veil, as he had not yet resigned priestly functions within the newly erected tabernacle. Such colloquy with God, as a man with his friend, had already been the privilege of Moses in a tent of meeting;² it now took place in this more elaborate and more significant meeting-place with God, which He Himself had designed. If we have at all followed the course of the preceding history, and have realized the purpose of the tabernacle, altar, and priesthood, we shall not consider it strange that the offerings also should be the subject of divine oracles. The occasion and the place alike called for a message from God Himself. How great was the occasion! Here were the people from whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ was to come; Christ in Whom all families of the earth were to be blessed. They were about to enter into their national inheritance, and to take possession of that land which was destined not only to be the home and shelter of traditional monotheism, for the benefit of the world, but also the scene of the incarnation of the Son of God, and of that mighty work of God by which He reconciled all things unto Himself. How great also was the place, the *tent of meeting*! We have seen how the

¹ Num. vii. 89.

² Exod. xxxiii. 7-11.

tent reproduced the plan of God, in following the pattern of a heavenly vision. We have seen, too, how that pattern was made like the eternal thought of God, in His purpose of incarnation, and in His design of mediation, that men might be brought near to Him in a place of meeting. All this we have had before us in preceding chapters, and we find no difficulty then, but on the contrary an a priori expectation that God Himself would intervene sooner or later to ensure that what was offered upon the altar, and within the tabernacle, would be strictly in accordance with His eternal plan. The details of that mystery of God were known only to Himself, and if they were not to be violated at every turn by the ignorance of men, He must Himself interpose with a divinely directed law of offerings. This the history affirms that He did, and it is the knowledge of this fact which leads us to a reverent study of its details and principles, with a patience which we could not spare for the study of a merely human sacrificial scheme. Our study will lead us, as we hope, to a firmer conviction that there is indeed in this law of offerings a consistency in the whole, and a perfection in detail, which certainly are not of human origin, but which argue the mind of God at its inception. The historic statement encourages research, and research confirms the history.

Another point to which we draw attention is the word *oblation* in the words, *When any man of you offereth an oblation unto Jehovah*. The Hebrew word is *korban*, with which we are familiar from its mention in the New Testament.¹ The noun occurs for the first time in the passage which we are considering, and is found in about seventy passages in the Old Testament, being used in every case of sacrificial or other² oblations brought to God. It is noticeable that the word is derived from the verb *karav*, which signifies *to approach* or *to draw near*, and is often used of approach to God.³ Other derivatives of this verb bear the sense of special nearness or intimacy, being used for the *inward parts* of the body, or for *a near neighbour or kinsman*. The verb itself in our English versions is very often rendered *offer*, and the Greek translators render it by the words ἐγγίζω, προσφέρω, προσέρχομαι, προσάγω. The noun *korban*, however, they always represent by δῶρον, but it is clear that the Hebrew word does not simply mean a gift, but something with which access is made to God. God Himself accordingly, from the tent of meeting, makes

¹ Mark vii. 11.² E.g. Num. vii. 3.³ E.g. Lev. xvi. 1; Num. xvi. 9; Ps. lxxv. 4.

known that kind of offering which He requires from every man who would draw near to Him.

We will now take up the law of an oblation of burnt-offering word by word, and clause by clause, assured that no direction given in this solemn manner can be without its lesson for ourselves.

If his oblation be a burnt-offering. The occasions when a man brought an oblation or access-offering of this kind were either when he felt prompted to make a *freewill offering* (Heb. *Nedavah*) or in fulfilment of a *vow*.¹ On such occasions his offering might take the form either of a burnt-offering or of a sacrifice of peace-offerings.² But the underlying intention in each case would not be the same. If the thought of homage or devotion to God was uppermost in his mind, the oblation would naturally take the form of a burnt-offering. On festal and social occasions of approach to God a sacrifice of peace-offerings would be more appropriate. But in either case the appointed ritual contained an important lesson for the Israelite. The practice of making vows was not in obedience to a Divine command; indeed, we seem to detect in the references to it a tacit disapproval of the custom. The legislation seems directed rather to the regulation of a prevailing habit, and animated by the desire to protect the Israelite from the guilt of unfulfilled pledges.³ The oblation of a freewill-offering, moreover, in spontaneous devotion or gratitude to Jehovah, was also an act rather of instinct and of custom than of Divine prescription. It was important, then, to impress upon the Israelite worshipper that the question of access to his God depended not upon what he himself proposed, but upon what God ordained. It was for God to dictate the terms of approach to Himself; and not only so, but the terms which God dictated were such as to manifest to the worshipper the need of a substitute for himself, both to die for him and to be accepted for him, before he himself could draw near to, or enjoy fellowship with his God. The lesson, translated into the terms of the reality, is a lesson for all time in the way of access to God. ✓

We are met now by alternative possibilities in the case of a burnt-offering. The oblation might be taken from the herd or from the flock, whether of sheep or goats, and also it might be a turtle-dove or young pigeon. This very fact must have suggested to the thoughtful Israelite that it was not the creature itself which was acceptable in the sight of God. To

¹ Lev. xxii. 18.

² *Ib.*, verse 21.

³ Deut. xxiii. 21-23.

us it is still more obvious that these regulations can only be symbolic. We will now follow the method which we have laid down for ourselves, and consider only the ritual for the chief of these alternatives, the burnt-offering taken from the herd, which will be found to contain the ritual in its most complete form.

If his oblation be a burnt-offering of the herd, he shall offer it a male without blemish. Here we at once detect a leading idea of the burnt-offering. It must be a *male*, that is the highest representative of its kind. This being an essential part of the burnt-offering idea, the same rule applies also to the lesser offerings from the sheep or goats; there also the oblation must be a male.¹ In pursuance of the same idea it must also be *without blemish*. This was indeed a general rule for all oblations to Jehovah, but in the sacrifice of peace-offerings blemishes of a certain kind were not an absolute bar to the use of the animal.² The exception made in this case throws into greater prominence the absolute character of the rule as applied to burnt-offerings, of which we read the emphatic statement, *Whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer; for it shall not be acceptable for you.*³ This is indeed an essential part of the idea of this offering, which cannot then admit of any modification. It is intended to be as like as possible to One Who is the Son of Man, the ideal and perfect representative of our nature, without fault and without stain.

He shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting. We have already shown that the door of the tent of meeting is the northern entrance to the tabernacle court. This entrance it will be remembered was situated almost certainly at the middle of the northern side. It was 10 medium cubits or 12 feet wide, and immediately opposite to it stood the altar, the base of which was at a distance of about 7 yards from the entrance. The altar is therefore spoken of here as being *at the door of the tent of meeting*.⁴ It is here directed that the larger burnt-offering should be presented and killed at this entrance of the court; while the lesser burnt-offering from the flock was to be killed *on the side of the altar northward before Jehovah*, that is between the entrance and the altar, while the birds were to be brought *to the altar* and killed there. It is probable that this distinction was merely on account of practical convenience. "The Talmud declares the offering of birds, so as to secure the blood, to have been the most difficult part

¹ Lev. i. 10.² *Ib.* xxii. 21-23.³ *Ib.* xxii. 20.⁴ Verse 5.

of a priest's work,"¹ and this may have been a reason why birds were brought to the altar. It is interesting to note that in the vision of Ezekiel there are places for slaying sacrificial victims both in and around the porch of the northern entrance.² It is probable then that the directions as to the place where the burnt-offerings were to be slain applied generally, unless there is a definite statement to the contrary. In Psalm CXVIII. 27 we do indeed find the words, *Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar*, as if the large animals were fastened to the horns of the altar and slain there. But there is no authority elsewhere for believing that this was the case, but rather the opposite, so that we must take the expression to be a pregnant one, and the sense to be, Bind the victim with cords till it is sacrificed, and its blood put upon the horns of the altar.³ At all events, in this case as always we must look to the chief sacrifice for the full ritual, and there we find that the offering was to be brought to the entrance of the tabernacle enclosure, and that certain ceremonies were to take place there before the worshipper passed in to meet with God. In this way the Israelite was at length admitted to *compass the altar* of God,⁴ and to worship towards His holy temple.

That he may be accepted before Jehovah. There is no doubt that this is the correct meaning of the Hebrew, and not as in the old version, *of his own voluntary will*. The object in bringing the oblation is that Jehovah may favourably accept the person of the offerer, and the condition for this is that he should bring the appointed offering and offer it at the appointed place. This is made quite plain in the words that follow:—

And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him.

We come now to the rite of laying on of hands. It may be noted that this ceremony is omitted in the case of the smallest burnt-offering of birds, and also in the case when birds were offered for a sin-offering. The idea of substitution and representation, which we have seen attaches to the rite, is sufficiently emphasized for this whole series of offerings; and since it is not the special feature of any, but the common property of all, it is sometimes omitted when the ritual is most curtailed. With the sole exception of the offering of birds, and one other even smaller kind of sin-offering, the laying on

¹ Edersheim's "The Temple," p. 115.

² Archdeacon Perowne in loc.

³ Ezek. XL. 39, 40.

⁴ Ps. xxvi. 6; cf. xliii. 4.

of hands was, we believe, invariably performed for every other variety of the four substitutionary offerings. It is true that in this chapter it is not mentioned in connection with the offering from the flock,¹ but we suspect an omission in the Hebrew text, as it is found in offerings of this class in peace-offerings and in the sin-offering, and the direction is supplied in the Septuagint. The words which we are now considering assure the worshipper who brings the appointed offering to the appointed place that God accepts the oblation, and accepts it for the man. The acceptability of the offering passes over, as it were, to the man; and when the offering makes atonement it makes it for the man. The special feature of the burnt-offering, however, is not the blood-shedding by which atonement is made, but the acceptability of the representative, by which the worshipper is accepted. It will not be going beyond the idea of these words, nor beyond what is distinctly stated of these substitutionary offerings elsewhere, to say that the acceptability of the oblation is *reckoned to the account of the man*. We read elsewhere of the sacrifice of peace-offerings that if the rules laid down by God for it are not complied with *it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be reckoned unto him that offereth it*.² The use of this word *reckoned* carries us back to the record of Abraham's act of faith, when in strong confidence in the Promiser *he believed in Jehovah, and He reckoned it to him*—the same word in the Hebrew—*for righteousness*.³ At that time Abraham's faith—so far as his standing before Jehovah was concerned—was counted to him *as if it were* righteousness.⁴ Here the offering is reckoned *as if it were* the man, and the acceptability of the offering causes him to be accepted. We see that the revelation of the mystery of sinful man's acceptance before God is advanced one step further.

In the history of Abraham we see that bare faith in the word of God avails to place righteousness to the account of the believer. Here we see that the righteousness which is placed to his account is the righteousness of Another. Faith is indeed still the condition on his part, for he hears the word of God and brings the appointed offering to the appointed place, and as he is commanded transfers his responsibilities to it. This is faith in action, and it is as always reckoned for righteousness; but the righteousness which accrues thereby to the account of the believer is now shown to be a real and

¹ Verses 10, 11.² Lev. vii. 18.³ Gen. xv, 6.⁴ Cf. the use of the same word in Num. xviii, 27,

concrete thing, namely, the righteousness of an Ideal Substitute and Representative of men. In the law for peace-offerings we shall see that the revelation of this deep mystery is carried still further, and that the Ideal Substitute and Representative not only offers His acceptable Person and Service to God for the benefit of all who believe in Him, but as a fact gives Himself to be in the believer and the believer in Him, so that His righteousness becomes that of the believer by an act of organic union between the two. When God reckons an account there is no mistake in His reckoning; what is reckoned by Him to any man is so reckoned because it properly belongs to that man; and the righteousness of Christ is reckoned only to those who are in Christ with a closeness of identity which, however mysterious, is none the less real, and is indeed a sure fact of revelation. The student of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans will recall how all this which we have been describing is a main theme of that epistle. There we read of a righteousness of God which is revealed in the Gospel unto all and upon all those who believe, answering to the experience of Abraham long ago. There also we see the *reckoning* or *imputation* of righteousness taken up and enlarged upon; and the Personality of the Representative whose blood atones for our sins and whose righteousness becomes our righteousness clearly made known. There once more the union of believers with their Representative is set forth in no indistinct manner, so that the salvation through Christ is seen to be the salvation in Christ.¹ There is one other particular in which the symbolism of these substitutionary sacrifices answers to that open exposition of the Gospel. St. Paul passes from his account of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, to show how the man thus redeemed must not and will not continue in sin, but has both the will and the power to yield himself in service to God. And true to this fact of redemption we find in the sacrificial law that the meal- and drink-offerings are an inseparable adjunct of the oblation by which a man is accepted. But, as we have noticed before, they are not themselves the offering by which he is accepted; and in the law which we are now considering they are for the time left out of view, exactly as they are left out of view by St. Paul until the Gospel of acceptance for the sake of Another has been propounded. But let us now turn back to the burnt-offering, which fixes our attention upon one element of the

¹ Rom. III.-VI.

complex fact, namely, the complete satisfaction which the Lord takes in our Representative, and His readiness to be pleased with us personally and with our service for His sake.

We need not enquire how far a consciousness of this truth was present to the mind of the Israelite worshipper. Probably spiritual men under the Old Covenant understood more than we are sometimes willing to allow.¹ But the point for us to remember is that it was quite clear to the mind of the Designer of these laws. It was indeed His own constant law of action towards the human race which he was gradually unfolding to the gaze of not only His chosen people but also we believe of angels in the heavenly regions. It is as if a door was opened into heaven, affording a glimpse into the glories of the Divine Wisdom, when these laws were framed. The door was opened wider as each successive prophet spoke of the salvation to be revealed; it stood wide open when the Son of God Himself came down from heaven, a Saviour, Christ the Lord. Then at length the mystery, hushed through times eternal, and whispered through the years of preparation, was at length made known to all nations for the obedience of faith. These are *the wonderful works which Jehovah his God had done and His thoughts which are to us-ward* which scintillated like points of light in the prophetic soul of the sweet Psalmist of Israel.² One of these Divine Thoughts took shape, and shining like a star uttered itself in words. The prophet seems to be passing on to us, telling forth from the depths of his prophetic consciousness, the utterance to which his soul had listened. There was One speaking to Jehovah and saying, *Sacrifice and offering Thou hast no delight in; mine ears hast Thou opened. Burnt-offering and sin-offering hast Thou not required, then said I, Lo, I am come; in the roll of the Book it is written of me; I delight to do what is acceptable to Thee,*³ *O my God; yea, Thy law is within my heart.* Here we have indeed a shining prophecy, a star of the first magnitude. The prophet forth-tells that there is One in the heavenly places in act to come. For Him in the

¹ Canon Girdlestone writes under the word *Altar* in "O.T. Synonyms," "The Rabbinical writers . . . called the Altar a Paraclete, i.e. an intercessor; it was regarded as a centre for mediation, peace-making, expiation, and sanctification".

² 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2; Ps. xl. 5 ff.

³ *Thy will*, R.V. The Hebrew word is *ratson*, the word used for *acceptance* in the sacrificial law, as in Lev. 1. 3. The Greek translation is *θέλημα*, the thing which is pleasing to God.

Divine counsels a human body is prepared, ears open to the Divine commands, and feet ready to run on the Divine errand; a heart also that delights in that which God approves, and hides within itself the law Divine. His work is already inscribed in the roll of the Book. The sacrifice and offering, the burnt-offering and sin-offering of that Book are only pictures of Himself. In themselves they can give no pleasure to His God. He comes Himself to render the service by which men may be accepted. This, then, is the *glad tidings of righteousness*, this is the Divine *faithfulness and salvation*, this the *lovingkindness and the truth* which the prophet had heard by the Word of the Lord, and which he could not and would not hide, and the tender mercies of which he implored for his own salvation.¹ *By this will*, then, that is by this acceptable service rendered by our Redeemer, *we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.*²

And he shall kill the bullock before Jehovah. We have already noticed how this act is prominent in all the substitutionary sacrifices. These are taken from living creatures³ so that they may suffer death. The death, moreover, is not merely a necessary preliminary to being burned upon the altar; it is evidently a chief part of the work of the substitute. The prominence given to the death of the victims in these sacrifices corresponds to the position which the death of our Lord holds in the fourfold Gospel. There is also a correspondence with the primitive record of Eden. At the entrance of that garden the flaming sword *turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life*. So here at the entrance to the tent of meeting with Him Whom truly to know is everlasting life there falls every way the stroke of judgment.

We cannot but see in the physical death of the offerer's representative a picture of the penalty due to sin. Death in man is always in Scripture the wages of sin. The penalty forewarned in case of disobedience was to die; and on the day of disobedience there was immediate and final exclusion from the tree of life, and the sentence of a return to dust. But it is clear that the penalty of sin includes for man more than mere physical dissolution. It affects his spiritual nature both here and in the life to come. It forfeits that union with God which alone is true life for man made in the image of God. But in the picture-language of the sacrificial system all this would be

¹ Ps. XL. 9-II.

² Heb. x. 1-10.

³ The single apparent exception will be noticed below in the chapter on the Sin-offering.

best set forth by cutting short the animal life of the representative offering. *He shall kill the bullock.* The only life which the bullock knows, the whole life which it was created to live, is cut short and brought to an end. It is an accurate, and also a vivid picture of the consequence of sin to man. And he shall kill the bullock *before Jehovah.* The word may remind us that death, in the comprehensive sense which we have indicated, is the immediate result of a sinful man meeting his unreconciled God. Or we may take it rather as indicating that it is Jehovah's claim which exacts the penalty; as when Samuel *hewed Agag in pieces before Jehovah.*¹ Even as the Divine decree had gone forth against Agag, and Samuel's action was in fulfilment of that *voice and word of Jehovah*;² so also a Divine decree had gone forth against men, both collectively and individually, and the action of the offerer in killing the bullock which represented him was with reference to that voice and word.³ All this is made as like as it is possible to make it to the actual experiences of the Son of God. It was reserved for later prophets to declare explicitly that the righteous Servant of Jehovah must be *cut off out of the land of the living*;⁴ or even more clearly with note of time and place that this fate should overtake the Christ.⁵ And in the fourfold Gospel we have the record of the outward aspects of this supreme Event. There we learn that His responsibility for men involved our Substitute and Representative in the experience of physical death, the parting asunder of body and spirit, and the cessation of the pulses of life. He became a dead man. We know further that before this consummation it involved Him in spiritual experiences of such an agonizing character as to force a sweat of blood from His brow. We know too that it brought upon His holy human spirit a sense of God-forsakenness. Beyond these things which He Himself has admitted men to witness—and are they not enough?—we know nothing, nor dare we conjecture. It is sufficient for us to know that *Jehovah hath made to light on Him the iniquity of us all*, and that He died *before Jehovah*. What Divine Justice and the inevitable and unalterable Decree demanded, that He has endured in full. He *died for our sins*, and now the entrance to the place of meeting stands open for each⁶ and for all who lay their hands upon "that dear Head," and there confess their sin.

And Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the blood. A

¹ 1 Sam. xv. 33.

⁴ Is. liii. 8.

² *Ib.* verses 22, 23.

⁵ Dan. ix. 26.

³ Gen. ii. 16, 17; iii. 8.

⁶ 1 Cor. viii. ii.

new element is now introduced into the picture in *Aaron's sons the priests*. We have spoken of these before as bearing a double reference in the symbolism. They are in some of their functions symbolic of the service due from every Israelite ; in others they were consecrated to share the functions of their father, who alone was invested with the office of mediator between God and His people. It is important then to notice that in the sacrificial ritual which we are considering the priests act in their capacity of sharing in the functions of Aaron, and not as symbolizing the service of the people of God. This seems sufficiently obvious from the circumstances of the case. If the priest was merely symbolizing the service of the offerer, why should he take the duty out of the hands of the offerer when he himself was present ? But there are further indications than this that the priest in all this ritual is really doing the work of Aaron. The phrase by which the priests are here described, *Aaron's sons the priests*, is significant in itself, and is made more so by the variation *the sons of Aaron the priest* which we find just below.¹ This variation, occurring at the commencement of this important section, is certainly designed. It does not meet us again throughout the whole of this passage,² where the priests are simply termed *Aaron's sons* or *the priests*, until the close, when we once more read of *Aaron the priest and his sons*.³ The inference is that the people spoken of as priests are so in the sense of sharing in the special functions of Aaron the priest. In the course of the section there is also pointed reference once and again to *the anointed priest*,⁴ in such a way as to show that the priestly functions here exhibited are his prerogative. We may then safely conclude that 'the priest' throughout this whole section may be taken, so far as its symbolic reference is concerned, as the equivalent of the high priest who, as we know, is made like the Son of God.

This seems to be the place briefly to review the history of a sacrificing priesthood, so far as it can be gathered from notices in Scripture. In the family of our first parents it is evident that individual members, such as Cain and Abel, themselves offered sacrifice. In the patriarchal histories the conduct of Divine service, whether by sacrifice or prayer,⁵ is usually ascribed to the head of the family, though Rebekah also goes to enquire of God,⁶ and Jacob when on a journey consecrates a stone.⁷ But it is probable that in the performance of family

¹ Verse 7.² Lev. I.-VII.³ *Ib.* VII. 34.⁴ *Ib.* III. 3, 16 ; VI. 22.⁵ Gen. XXI. 33.⁶ *Ib.* XXV. 22,⁷ *Ib.* XXVIII. 18 ; cf. also Job XLII. 8,

or tribal worship a custom would be established with regard to the officiating minister. The head of the family, or his first-born son, and the prince or chief of the tribe, would himself act in this capacity, and to him was given the title of *cohen* or *priest*. The derivation of this word is lost in obscurity, but there are indications that it originally denoted a chief as the leader of his people in the service of God.¹ The first to bear this title in Scripture is Melchisedek,² the King of Jerusalem, and his seems to be a typical case. Such a priest also was Reuel, the father-in-law of Moses, in Midian. Forty years later we find Jethro the priest of Midian; and if he was indeed, as seems likely, the son of Reuel, and the brother-in-law of Moses, this presents an interesting case of the son succeeding to the chieftainship and priestly office of his father. We have already noticed how Jethro on his visit to his brother-in-law at Rephidim *took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God, and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' brother-in-law before God*. The omission of the name of Moses from the invited guests is most naturally accounted for by supposing that he was present as a member of the tribe of Midian, of which his brother-in-law was chieftain and priest. A family and tribal priesthood of this kind evidently existed also among the Israelites. Moses as leader of the people built an altar at Rephidim after the victory over Amalek.³ A little later at Sinai we read of *the priests that come near to Jehovah*.⁴ Perhaps these are the same as the *young men of the children of Israel* whom Moses sent to offer sacrifices upon the altar built beneath Sinai,⁵ but the identification can scarcely be said to be certain. It is evident from these notices that up to this time there was no fixed priestly order among the Israelites. The office was shared by many, and it was more representative than mediatorial in character. The priest was merely the officiating minister in the conduct of Divine service.⁶ But, as we have seen above, it was the purpose of God to show by a complex arrangement of sanctuary and sacrifice the true principles of human approach to God. The tent of meeting was made a true picture of Him in Whom we meet with God. The altar was designed to be an accurate likeness of Him through Whom rises all acceptable service. And then, finally, the offices of

¹ The word seems to denote *princes* or *chief ministers* in Job xii. 19; 2 Sam. viii. 18; xx. 26; 1 Kings iv. 5. Possibly in each case the office was in some way connected with Divine service.

² Gen. xiv. 18.

³ Exod. xvii. 15.

⁴ *Ib.* xix. 22, 24.

⁵ *Ib.* xxiv. 5.

⁶ Compare the English saying that "every man is priest in his own household."

Divine ministry were appropriated to the same great end. The family and tribal priesthood were set aside, as conveying wrong or at least incomplete ideas of the unique Person and work upon Whom all Divine service by men depended. A brother of the redeemer from Egypt was chosen and made like the Son of God ; and to him and to his sons was intrusted the whole conduct of the ritual of offerings. In this way there was stamped upon the office of priesthood an additional character, owing to the necessity of its corresponding to the great Archetype of all. It no longer remained a mere office of leadership in Divine service, but became rather the exponent of those mediatorial functions by which men are enabled to draw near to God. Meanwhile the original idea of leadership in Divine service was by no means abandoned, as we have already noticed in a former chapter, when speaking of the service of the inferior priests ; and to this official ministry in the tabernacle service the Levites also were admitted,¹ but the title of priest was reserved for the officers of mediation, the chosen types of the Christ.

What has been written above will make plain the force of the phrase *Aaron's sons the priests*. The distinction is between the mediating priesthood lately inaugurated and all other priests which existed among the Israelites. There is a somewhat similar expression which occurs in the Book of Deuteronomy² and also in the Book of Joshua, and in later books,³ namely, *the priests the Levites*, the point of which is the same. There were at the time other priests than those of *the Levitical priesthood*.⁴ *The priests the sons of Levi*⁵ were the well-known ministers of the sanctuary, the descendants of the Levite Aaron. The family and tribal priesthood lingered long in Israel, as might be expected, and though sometimes tolerated it was at all times of spiritual revival discouraged or suppressed. The practice of private or family sacrificial worship was especially liable to the growth of abuses. Even though it might be, as indeed it was, the survival of primitive and authorised custom, it was not calculated to preserve the true tradition, except under the strict control of Divine regulations. These regulations had already appropriated the whole of the priestly office to the service of the tent of meeting, and had invested it with additional characteristics, so as not merely to preserve the

¹ Num. xviii. 2-6.

² E.g. Deut. xvii. 9.

³ E.g. Josh. iii. 3 ; cf. also 2 Chron. v. 5 ; xxx. 27 ; Ezek. xliv. 15 ; Is. lxvi. 21.

⁴ Heb. vii. 11.

⁵ Deut. xxi. 5.

tradition of sacrificial worship, but to make it a true picture of the promised Saviour and His work of mediation. It was then a mark of spiritual decline when in the history of Israel sacrificial worship was performed upon high places with primitive rites and a non-Levitical priesthood. It is only the service of the tent of meeting and of the priests, the sons of Aaron, who ministered there, which we can now study as corresponding to the eternal fact of mediation between God and men; all else has drifted, as it must have done quite universally but for Divine interference, into paths of darkness and error if not of cruelty and of vice.

We praise the Divine Wisdom that planned the central sanctuary, and chose and legislated for the priests the sons of Aaron, and caused the record of His plan and of His laws to be preserved through the ages, so that we may recognize the Divine Idea, however much it may have failed of realization in the history of a nation no less weak and sinful than all other nations on the earth.

The appointed mediator in the sanctuary then is to *present the blood*; and with this act the whole work of bringing the offerer near to God passes out of his own hands into the hands of the priest. Here we have to consider two points, first the meaning of the blood, and next the meaning of the act of presentation by the priest. The blood is without doubt the symbol of a death having taken place. The offerer kills the victim, and the priest catches the blood of the killing. In Scripture blood is looked upon as the vehicle of life; an organism lives while the blood courses in its veins,¹ it dies when its blood is shed.² Shed blood in a bowl is therefore the symbol of death. It is indeed a truer picture of life laid down than the carcass of the animal, for that bodily frame is not in itself either living or dead. The life of the flesh, in Scripture language—and may we not also say in strict scientific language?—is in the blood; and for this reason, we are expressly told, God chose the blood and nothing else to be the emblem of a life-surrender.³ On the altar, in the picture, the blood of animals; because in the reality there is surrendered life. It is almost certain that

¹ Gen. ix. 4, 5.

² *Ib.* verse 6.

³ Lev. xvii. 10-16. *Blood* is indeed not seldom a synonym for the loss of life, i.e. for *death*, whether for physical death, as e.g. Is. i. 15; Ezek. xxxv. 6; Matt. xxiii. 35; xxvii. 24, 25; Heb. xii. 4; Rev. xviii. 24; or spiritual death, as e.g. Acts xviii. 6; xx. 26. The phraseology in Ex. xxxiv. 25 is also significant, "Thou shalt not offer (Heb. *kill*) the blood of my (passover) sacrifice with leavened bread".

a Divine command directed our first parents to approach God through blood-shedding. It is quite certain that at the new starting-point of the human race after the overwhelming catastrophe of the Flood, God began to draw the attention of mankind to the mystery of physical life, that mysterious something hidden as it seemed in the coursing blood of men and animals.¹ It was an extension of this teaching when at the great Redemption from Egypt the freedom of the Israelites was bought by lives surrendered, and enjoyed under the shelter of shed blood. But it was reserved for the present time, and for the law of the offerings, to fix the attention of Israel, and in due time also of the world, upon the mystery of vicarious death. In the sacrificial law blood-shedding leaps, as it were, at one bound into the greatest prominence, a position which it never loses in the pages of Holy Writ, nor in the hearts of God's chosen people, nor indeed at any period as far as we can see into the life of the world to come.² This is because it is all made like the eternal fact that by *the blood of His cross*³ the Son of God reconciled all things to His Father.

We come now to consider the act of presentation. The verb used in the original is that from which the word *korban* is derived, and of which we have already spoken. It denotes that the blood is brought near. In the law for the burnt-offering the ritual of the blood is not the salient feature, and we find accordingly in the lesser forms of the offering that the presentation of blood is altogether omitted. In the offering of a bullock, however, it is prescribed. In this case the blood was brought near to Jehovah probably by the bowl in which it was contained⁴ being lifted in the direction of the tabernacle or perhaps of the altar, but more probably we think towards the tabernacle, as the taking of it to the altar followed later. The death of the victim had taken place before Jehovah, that is, to meet His righteous claims, and the token of this is now brought near as it were for Him to see. In other offerings, where the significance of the Death is the leading thought in the ritual, this simple act of raising the bowl of shed blood towards the tabernacle is developed into a presentation upon the horns of the altar, or an elaborate aspersion within the Holy Place before the veil, and even within the central shrine itself, in front of the mercy-seat.

¹ Gen. ix. 1-6.

² Rev. v. 6, 13; xxii. 3.

³ Col. i. 20.

⁴ Bowls (lit. bowls-for-sprinkling), made of brass, are mentioned among the accessories of the altar in Exod. xxvii. 3; cf. Zech. ix, 15; xiv, 20.

We see here only the germ of that fuller development, but it is in strict accordance with the truth that the Son of God died to meet and satisfy the claims of Divine Justice. The fact that it is the priest who presents the blood is also in close correspondence with the reality which is represented; for it is Christ Himself who after suffering death upon the cross rose again with the Body that died, and with it ascended into Heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us.

And sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is at the door of the tent of meeting. Here we meet with the altar, of which we have already spoken at length. The altar, as its Hebrew name implies, and as we see in the instance of Abraham's sacrifice upon Moriah, was originally the place of slaughter. But in the present regulations the actual slaughter of the victims took place at some little distance from the altar itself, except in the case of birds, which were brought near to the altar before being killed. It is clear that the altar itself is intended as a picture of Him who became Man that He might raise mankind to God. The altar is that ladder set up on the earth, the top of which reached to heaven,¹ which Jacob saw in his dream. It is pre-eminently the place upon which every ascending-offering passes upwards to Jehovah. Now it is very noticeable that the shed blood of the victim is, we believe, never spoken of in Scripture as ascending upon the altar in the same way in which the smoke and vapour of the burnt-offerings ascended. Drink-offerings of blood, even the blood of sons and daughters, may have been poured out upon heathen altars as an acceptable sacrifice to demons,² but we never read of blood being poured out as a libation³ upon the fires of the altar of burnt-offering. It is quite true, as we have already seen, that the blood was presented before Jehovah as a satisfaction of His just and necessary claims. But it is not true, we believe, that the blood was offered upon the altar of burnt-offering. The relation of the blood to the altar is then a matter for careful consideration. We read here that it was to be *sprinkled round about upon the altar*, or, in the case of the lesser offering of birds, *drained out on the side of the altar*. In the case of a sacrifice of peace-offerings, the rule was the same, to *sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about*. But in the case of the sin-offerings, where the ritual with the blood is most fully developed, we shall find the best illustration of

¹ Gen. xxviii. 12.

² Ps. xvi. 4; cvi. 37, 38.

³ The idea in 2 Tim. iv. 6 is entirely different. That was the blood of martyrdom, not of atonement.

the connection between the blood and the altar. We shall see that in certain forms of sin-offering part of the blood was presented within the tabernacle. In all these cases the rest of the blood was *poured out at the base of*, that is at the bottom of, *the altar of burnt-offering*.¹ In other forms of the sin-offering the blood was not taken within the sanctuary, and in these cases it was presented by being *put upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering*, and the rest was as before poured out at the bottom of the altar.² Even in the case of one of the smallest varieties of sin-offering the ritual of the blood is still special and significant; the presentation here takes place by sprinkling upon the side of the altar, while *the rest of the blood is drained out at the bottom of the altar*.³ On a review of this ritual it will not be questioned that, apart from the symbolism of the acts of presentation, the blood is represented as lying at the base of the altar work. It is sprinkled upon it round about, and lies as it were in a pool at its base. We take the sprinkling of blood upon the altar then to have the same symbolic reference as the sprinkling of blood upon the mercy-seat. We have already explained the significance of that act to be that the Incarnate Son of God exercises the Divine prerogative of pardoning sins in virtue of His blood-shedding. And similarly we explain the ritual connection of the shed blood with the altar of burnt-offering to be that the atoning death of the Incarnate Saviour lies *at the base of all His work for men. Thou wast slain and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe and tongue and people and nation and madest them to be unto our God . . . priests*.⁴ According to the true Christian tradition, the dying of Christ for our sins comes first of all in the message of the Gospel; and this is indeed, as St. Paul says, according to the Scriptures.⁵

And he shall flay the burnt-offering and cut it into its pieces. We take this to be the action of the offerer himself, in continuation of his original act of slaying the victim. He has passed over to his oblation his whole responsibility before Jehovah. That responsibility implied not only the necessity of atonement by a life-surrender, but also the obligation to render an acceptable service. The first necessity has been met by the victim dying at the hands of the offerer, which we took to emphasize the fact that the death was the death due from the offerer. The second obligation is now to be fulfilled by the

¹ Lev. iv. 7, 18.⁴ Rev. v. 9, 10.² *Ib.* 25, 30, 34.⁵ 1 Cor. xv, 1-3.³ *Ib.* v. 9.

burning of the whole clean animal upon the altar. The offerer's own hands then prepare the victim for the service, to preserve the recollection that it is the service due from himself. It is obvious that the flaying and cutting in pieces of the victim in no sense made it fit for an acceptable sacrifice. That depended on its own intrinsic completeness and freedom from blemish, which had already been assured before it was presented for use in this service.¹ The flaying and cutting in pieces by the offerer preparatory to the burning on the altar by the priest were a pledge to the offerer that the work of acceptance was for him, no less than the work of atonement; and were a further invitation and opportunity for the exercise of that personal faith and individual application which in the Gospel is always set before us as a condition of salvation through Christ.

We may here draw attention to the fact that the killing of the victim, and the flaying and cutting of it in pieces by the offerer himself, although apparently directed by the ritual, was almost certainly modified in practice. In the Book of Chronicles we read of priests both killing and flaying the offerings;² and it is interesting to note that in the Septuagint version of this sacrificial law the act of slaying is sometimes attributed to the offerer,³ and sometimes expressed in a general way, *they shall slay*.⁴ We are inclined to believe, however, that our Hebrew text preserves the original form of the law, for one reason because it is consistent throughout. It is true that in the lesser form of sacrifice of birds the priest himself is to wring off the head and catch the blood,⁵ but in all other cases the act of killing is invariably ascribed to the offerer. And in one case where a number of people offer the sacrifice, as in the sin-offering for the elders of the congregation, the phraseology is significantly altered to *the bullock shall be killed before Jehovah*;⁶ as much as to say that the offerers being many they must decide amongst themselves who is to represent them in the act of killing. If there had been no special significance in the direction *he shall slay* as directing the offerer himself to perform the action, the phraseology, we think, in the case of many offerers would have remained as *they shall slay*; and much less would it have been changed if the killing had properly belonged to the priest, as whether the offerers were many or a single individual only would not in that case have altered the position. Finally we

¹ Lev. XXII. 20.

² 2 Chron. XXIX. 24, 34.

³ As in Lev. III. 2, 8, but not in verse 13.

⁴ As in *Ib.* I. 5, 11.

⁵ *Ib.* I. 15; V. 8.

⁶ *Ib.* IV. 15.

consider that the regulation as it stands offers an exact correspondence with the archetype of the whole system; while the assignment of the killing and flaying and other preparation of the victim either to the priests or to other assistants introduces a discordant note into the harmony. But it is quite possible that in this particular the ideal was intended to give way to the practical; and that the priest and his assistants performed these functions where it was inconvenient to the offerer from his ignorance or from other circumstances to do so. For this modification of the rule the action of the priest in killing the birds offered in sacrifice might form a precedent. The point is of interest, if not of great importance. It may be indeed, however, that the divinely appointed ritual deliberately departed from prevailing customs in assigning the slaying and preparation of the victim to the offerer and not to the officiating priest, as it seems to have done also in removing the blood from the altar-fires, so as to exhibit a closer likeness to the realities which were being represented. In the former case at least custom seems to have proved stronger than prescription, while in the latter—which is perhaps a more vitally important matter—the newer ritual prevailed. These observations are offered for the reader's consideration; they are not pressed as definite conclusions.

And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay wood in order upon the fire; and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall lay the pieces, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar; but its inwards and its legs shall he wash with water. And the priest shall burn the whole on the altar, for a burnt-offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Jehovah. We come now to the central act of the burnt-offering, and we notice that the whole work is in the hands of the priest. The representative of the offerer has laid down its life. The priest, who takes up the work of reconciliation from the point to which the victim has carried it, now carries all forward to completion, using as he does so the body of the victim, and the instrumentality of the altar, all which things as we know are but co-ordinate figures of the Christ. The offerer indeed passes from view while the work which is to result in his acceptance proceeds. We believe indeed that he is glanced at in the words *its inwards and its legs shall he wash with water*. This act we take it had already taken place, when the offerer was engaged in flaying and cutting the victim in pieces, and was part of his preparation of the oblation for its

offering upon the altar. It is mentioned here, and not in the former connection, because it is peculiar to the burnt-offering, and related to its central purpose which is here directly in view. But with this apparent not real exception the whole of this paragraph concerns priest, offering, and altar alone, and the offerer, as we have said, passes out of view. The work for his acceptance is going forward, and he has no part in it;¹ an arrangement which is once more true to the eternal conception of the work of the Son of God. Upon that work, as symbolized in this ritual for the burnt-offering, let us now fix our attention.

As regards the offering itself, we notice that special pains is taken to make it the picture of a spotless Person. We have already remarked that in the selection of a victim for this offering a blemish of any kind was an absolute bar to its use. This is still further emphasized by the direction that the inwards and legs or feet² were to be washed with water. This act is peculiar to the burnt-offering, and is related to its special significance, so that it or its equivalent is found even in the contracted ritual of the lesser burnt-offerings. The inwards and legs of sheep and goats were washed in the same manner as those of the bullock, and even with birds the priest is to *take away its crop with the filth thereof, and to cast it beside the altar on the east part, in the place of the ashes*. We may note in passing that the priest in this case not only kills the bird for the offerer, but performs also for him the office of preparation of the victim to be laid as a pure offering upon the altar.

As regards the treatment of the victim thus qualified and prepared in the true likeness of Him in Whom was no spot of sin, the central and salient fact is that *the whole* was laid upon the altar, and thence made to ascend as a sweet savour unto Jehovah. The Greek translators have seized upon the central idea of this offering in rendering it *ὁλοκαύτωμα* or *ὁλοκαύτωσις*, a holocaust. But the idea had already been expressed in the Hebrew title of *calil*, a whole burnt-offering. We notice that the fact that *the whole* is to be offered upon the altar finds particular mention also in the lesser offerings from the flock. But it cannot but be significant that the whole is not viewed in its totality alone, but as the sum of all its separate parts. It is plain that all victims of sacrifice must have been divided in some way, at least for the separation of the fat, or of special

¹ The presence of the meal-offering is, we believe, designedly suppressed in this connection.

² LXX.

portions of the carcass, as well as for convenience in carrying to the altar and burning upon it. But this division of the animal is not mentioned except in connection with the burnt-offering, and there it finds a place even in the ritual for the offering of birds, where we read that the priest was to *rend the bird by the wings thereof*. There can be little doubt that this direction, which is quite peculiar to this offering,¹ is intended to correspond with the cutting in pieces of the victims from the herd and flock. At the same time the re-collection of all the pieces, summarized as *the pieces, the head, and the fat*, in those offerings, finds its counterpart in the direction *not to divide the bird asunder* and to place the head which had been wrung or pinched off from its body also upon the altar. There is indeed one part of the victim which was not placed upon the altar, and that is the skin of the animals² and the crop in the case of the birds. We believe that the skin is excepted for the same reason that *the crop with the filth thereof* is discarded, namely, because of the impurities clinging to it; and this exception, which may be implied in the ritual directions but is expressly mentioned only in a later chapter, in no degree detracts from the picture of the lifting to God of the whole and of every several part of the spotless victim.

The steps by which the whole was lifted Godwards now claim our attention. Let us recall the words of this true oracle of God. The altar is built and ready for the purpose, with its base of earth and its brazen top. *The sons of Aaron the priest put fire upon the altar, and lay wood in order upon the fire; and Aaron's sons the priests lay the pieces, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar. Finally the priest burns*—causes to ascend in smoke and vapour—*the whole on the altar, for an ascending-offering, an offering-made-by-fire*, which causes to ascend, *of a sweet savour unto Jehovah*. First the altar, then the fire upon it, then the wood upon that, then the limbs one by one upon the wood until all were there, and so the sweet savour mounting, soaring, carried up to Jehovah. This is no fancy picture, it is all described, and described again and yet again with each alternative form of the offering,³ although as usual with somewhat less fulness of detail than in the chief and greatest offering. Still the effect is undoubtedly present even in the last and smallest, and it is an effect which is of the essence of an ascending-offering.

Now that we have the facts clearly before us let us look

¹ Cf. Lev. v. 8.

² *Ib.* vii. 8.

³ Verses 12, 17.

back upon them, and consider what it was that determined the form and manner of this ascending-offering. It cannot be doubted surely of whom these things were written, and according to whose likeness they were framed. They were made to resemble Him, whom St. Peter, who had companied with Him, compared to a *lamb without blemish and without spot*.¹ But this Life was not one of mere negative virtue alone, it was replete with positive excellences; it was the highest representative of its kind; it was, as the world recognizes, the Ideal Man. This Man, moreover, offered His whole life and powers, and every moment of the one, every department of the other, to the service of God in the mission with which He had been entrusted. Again it is not only that He fulfilled all righteousness, but that He did so as the servant of God; not only that His life was filled with doing good, but that He did it as accomplishing the work which His Father gave Him to do. His every action, His whole being was *godliness*, was *piety*, as the sparks fly upward. Add to this the fact, which we know from His own lips to be the case, that for our sakes He sanctified Himself that we too may be sanctified in truth, and we see the archetypal pattern according to which the burnt-offering for acceptance was framed.

The correspondence is so exact, and indeed so beautiful, that we are compelled to dwell upon it somewhat more in detail, not, we trust, giving reins to our fancy, but seeking to realize the blessed reality. How was it then that all this came about? What was the secret and what the process by which man became a sweet savour? We know that it came about by the Son of God assuming human nature in the womb of a Virgin and by the operation of the Holy Spirit. That which is born in this way must be in His living both pure and holy, both sanctified and sinless. This lies at the root of the whole happening. But we have seen in a former chapter that the altar presents a faint but perfectly true likeness to this mystery of the Incarnation.

Upon the altar the priest laid fire. Within the humanity which the Son of God assumed by His own act of volition He laid the fire of a human soul burning with zeal for the cause of His Father. Witness His boyhood's absorbed interest in the things of His Father; and in His manhood the twice-repeated fire of His anger at unholy desecration of that Father's house.

¹ 1 Pet. i. 19.

Upon the fire the priest laid wood in order. Upon the deliberate God-directed choice of His free human spirit the Son of God laid in order year by year the appointed means of grace, the Word of God, the worship of synagogue and temple, the life and teachings of an ordered home, the holy Sabbath Day, the practice of prayer. The holy fire leaped then into flame as the child grew and waxed strong by these means, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him.

Upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar the priest then places all the limbs, every one and the complete whole, and so the sweet savour rises as far as unto Jehovah. The Son of God surrendered to the holy flame of His consuming love and devotion to His Father each and all of every human power which He possessed. And His Father testified from Heaven that He was well-pleased with the offering, so that the sweet savour of that life ascended to Jehovah's presence.

We cannot forbear some reference in closing to the fact that the meal- and drink-offering of the worshipper ascended also as a sweet savour, but always upon the fires of the burnt-offering. We shall have to speak of this more at length in a later chapter, we only draw attention to it now as one more point of resemblance between the symbol and the reality. It is the sacrifice of Christ Jesus our Lord for us which kindles the flame of devotion to the service of God in our own hearts ; and that flame leaps and burns in us by the use of the same means of grace which He used, so that we place all our labours upon it as an ascending-offering to God. God receives and accepts these labours because they are lifted into His presence upon the Person of His beloved Son, whose historic Incarnation and acceptable service, with the underlying fact of His Atonement, stand now for us men and for our salvation as they have ever stood in the Divine counsels, and as they will stand unto the ages of the ages.

"A SWEET SAVOUR."

The phrase *a sweet savour* is literally *a savour of rest* (*rēach nichoach*), the root meaning of the word for "rest" being that of settling or quieting down after trouble or disturbance. It is applied to all fire-offerings made upon the altar of burnt-offering, as the following analysis of the occurrences of the phrase in Scripture will show :—

1. Of burnt-offerings: Gen. VIII. 21; Exod. XXIX. 18, 25, 41; Lev. I. 9, 13, 17; VIII. 21; XXIII. 18; Num. XV. 3, 24; XXVIII. (six times); XXIX. (five times).

2. Of the parts of the ram of consecration which were burned upon the altar: Lev. VIII. 28.

3. Of the fat of peace-offerings: Lev. III. 5, 16; XVII. 6; Num. XV. 3; XVIII. 17.

4. Of the fat of sin-offerings: Lev. IV. 31.

5. Of the memorial of the meal-offerings which was burnt upon the altar: Lev. II. 2, 9; VI. 15, 21; XXIII. 13, 18; Num. XXIX. 6.

6. Of the libation of drink-offerings: Lev. XXIII. 18; Num. XV. 7, 10; XXIX. 6.

7. Of fire-offerings upon the altar generally: Lev. II. 12; XXVI. 31; Num. XV. 13, 14.

(The phrase is used also by Ezekiel of offerings made to idols: Ezek. VI. 13; XVI. 19; XX. 28; and figuratively of the service of God by restored and repentant Israel, XX. 41. The original in Ezra VI. 10, Dan. II. 46 is not the full phrase which we are considering here.)

It is clear from the use of the phrase that the idea conveyed is that of restful satisfaction in the heart of God, brought about by contemplation of the fire-offering. This is implied on the first occasion when the phrase is used, which is also the first distinct mention of a burnt-offering, *Noah offered burnt-offerings on the altar, and Jehovah smelled the sweet savour*. It is also clearly stated in Num. XXVIII. 2, where God speaks of the fire-offerings as a *sweet savour unto Me*, or *a savour of My rest*. The settling down, the quiet after disturbance, brought about by the fire-offering is in the heart of God. The language is of course anthropomorphic, but it answers to a reality. The trouble and disturbance in the heart of God which is quieted and set to rest is that which is described in an earlier Scripture, where we read that *it repented Jehovah that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart* (Gen. VI. 6). Now in that to which the burnt-offering and the meal- and drink-offerings point God sees cause for satisfaction. He sees His own ideal in the creation of man actually realized in the Son of Man, and He sees also the evidence of a new race of men in the works of those who are in Christ.

The Greek translators render *rēach nichoach* by ὁσμὴ εὐωδίας, and it is interesting to observe that St. Paul uses these words twice and twice only in his epistles, once in relation to the

sacrifice of Christ Who *loved us and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odour of a sweet smell* (Eph. v. 2); and once of the loving service of Christians to one another for the sake of the Name, which is truly *an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God* (Phil. iv. 18). This use of the words answers exactly to the interpretation which we have given of the burnt-and the meal-offerings respectively, to which offerings alone the phrase *a sweet savour* is applied in the Old Testament.

There is a phrase which occurs four times in the Book of Ezekiel which it may be useful to compare with *the savour of rest* of the fire-offerings. We read there of God causing His wrath to rest by the execution of judgment (Ezek. v. 13; xvi. 42; xxi. 17; xxiv. 13), and of God Himself being thereby "comforted," and "quiet," and "no more angry".

But here the pleasure of God is evidently not in the execution of judgment, but in the quieting of His wrath, and in the sheathing of His sword (Jer. XLVII. 6). To use human language of God, that which fills His heart with rest and satisfaction is the sight of men doing what they were created to do. This sight He beheld in His Incarnate Son, and behold, it was "very good," and "well-pleasing"; a true savour of rest, and an absolute reversal of His former repentance and grief. And towards sinful men His wrath is appeased and laid to rest by the atonement of His Son; and in their works too, offered through Him, He finds grateful satisfaction, as signs of their new creation, and pledges of their final restoration in the likeness of His Son.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SACRIFICE OF PEACE-OFFERINGS OR FELLOWSHIP.

THE chief authorities for our knowledge of the peace-offerings are as follows :—

Lev. III. : addressed to the children of Israel, concerning the sacrifice.

Lev. VII. 11-21 : addressed to Aaron and his sons, concerning the feast.

Lev. VII. 22-27 : addressed to the children of Israel, concerning the fat and the blood. Cf. Lev. XVII. 8-16.

Lev. VII. 28-34 : addressed to the children of Israel, concerning the due of the priests.

Lev. XVII. 1-7 : addressed to Aaron and his sons and to the children of Israel, concerning the slaughter of animals for food.

Deut. XII : ordinances modifying the above rules in view of the entry into Canaan.

Lev. XXII. 21-25 : addressed to Aaron and his sons and all the children of Israel, concerning the victims.

Num. XV. 1-16 : addressed to the children of Israel, concerning the meal- and drink-offerings to accompany the sacrifice of peace-offerings ; rules to be observed after entry into Canaan.

Num. XVIII. 11 ; Deut. XVIII. 3 : the due of the priests.

THE NAME.

The offering which we have now to consider is called *a sacrifice of peace-offerings* ¹ (*zevach shelamim*). It is, however, sometimes called simply *a sacrifice* (*zevach*), or again simply *peace-offerings*. Indeed there is one passage where we read of *doing the service of Jehovah before Him with burnt-offerings and with sacrifices, and with peace-offerings*,² as if sacrifices and peace-

¹ Lev. III. 1.

² Josh. XXII. 27.

offerings were two distinct forms of oblation. But we may be reasonably sure that no distinction is meant, further than that the word *sacrifices* (*zevachim*) may possibly refer to the sacrificial victims, and the word *peace-offerings* (*shelamim*) to the whole constituents of the sacrificial feast. With regard then to the term *zevach*, in certain places¹ the verb *zavach*, from which the noun is derived, evidently means no more than to kill for food, without any notion of sacrificial offering. This meaning may not be altogether absent from the word even in 2 Kings XXIII. 20, where Josiah is said to have slain (or sacrificed) the priests of Bethel upon the altar there; and again in Psalm CVI. 37, where the children of Israel are said to have sacrificed their sons and their daughters to demons. It is probable that in both these cases the heathen conception of a victim being slaughtered to make a meal for the gods was present to the writer's mind. Moses also speaks in scorn of false gods who ate the fat of *zevachim* and drank the wine of drink-offerings.² But the constant use of the word *zevach* in Scripture is to denote the slaughter of victims for a sacrificial meal. Its first occurrence is in Gen. XXXI. 54, where we read that *Jacob sacrificed a sacrifice in the mountain and called his brethren to eat bread*. The next time we find the word is also in connection with the history of Jacob. When he came to Beersheba on his way with his whole family to Egypt he *sacrificed sacrifices* there³ unto the God of his father Isaac. In this case, however, there is no distinct mention of a sacrificial meal. Passing over some hundreds of years we come to the time of Moses, who requests permission from Pharaoh for the children of Israel to go three days' journey into the wilderness *to hold a feast and sacrifice* to Jehovah.⁴ On a later occasion, also in speaking to Pharaoh, he distinguishes between *sacrifices* (*zevachim*) and burnt-offerings (*oloth*).⁵ The Passover Rite is called *a sacrifice*.⁶ Jethro took a burnt-offering and *sacrifices* for God, and with his invited guests ate bread before Him.⁷ So at the ratification of the Covenant, Moses sent young men to offer burnt-offerings and *sacrifice sacrifices of peace-offerings* of oxen unto Jehovah.⁸ It was probably of these sacrifices that the elders ate and drank on the mount.⁹

These notices are sufficient to show that from the time of Jacob's return from Haran until the Exodus it was customary

¹ E.g. Deut. XII. 15, 21; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 24; 1 Kings XIX. 21; Ezek. XXXIV. 3.

² Deut. XXXII. 38.

³ Gen. XLVI. 1.

⁴ Exod. V. 1-3.

⁵ *Ib.* X. 25.

⁶ *Ib.* XII. 27.

⁷ *Ib.* XVIII. 12.

⁸ *Ib.* XXIV. 5.

⁹ *Ib.* verse 11.

among the chosen people not only to offer burnt-offerings, but to slay animals in preparation for a sacrificial feast, and that this act was termed *zevach*, a sacrifice. It is an interesting question whether the earlier patriarchs also observed this custom, but on this point Scripture is silent. It is true that the Hebrew word (*mizbēach*), which is used in our records for the altars of Noah and Abraham, is derived from the verb *zavach*, but this can scarcely be taken as a proof that these patriarchs offered *zevachim* as well as 'oloth upon their altars. By the time of Moses indeed the term had already lost its etymological meaning, for it was applied not only to the altar of burnt-offering, upon which no slaughter took place, but also to the altar of incense. We believe, however, that the patriarchal histories are contemporary records which were combined into the Book of Genesis either by Moses or before his time. There is no difficulty in the use of the term *mizbēach* in the time of Abraham, if sacrificial meals had already become customary amongst surrounding nations, which was almost certainly the case, or even if heathen notions of slaying animals as food for the gods had stamped themselves upon current language. But as regards the Book of the generations of Noah the case is different. Here we may note first that it is distinctly stated that Noah's offering was a burnt-offering; and secondly that we do not know the language in which this record was first committed to writing, or when and by whom it was transliterated or translated. On the whole then while Scripture speaks of the building of altars and offering burnt-offerings upon them, it is silent on the offering of *zevachim* by the heirs of the true tradition up till the time of Jacob. It may be significant of the origin of this form of sacrifice that it appears first among the chosen people in the history of Jacob, and immediately after his long residence amongst idolaters, and indeed in connection with a covenant made with them. There are many indications of the prevalence of sacrificial feasts among other races at the time of the exodus. Pharaoh understood burnt-offerings and sacrifices well, though he disclaimed all knowledge of Jehovah. Exod. XXII. 20 and Lev. XVII. 7 show how common the practice was in the worship of other gods, and the latter passage shows how grave were the abuses connected with it. Exod. XXXIV. 15, 16 refers plainly to the same custom and similar abuses as existing in Canaan. Under the very shadow of Sinai, no doubt with the memory of what they had seen in Egypt before them, the Israelites offered burnt-offerings and brought peace-offerings to the golden calf, and sat down to eat

and drink, and rose up to play.¹ What a contrast was this orgy of immorality and licence to that sacrificial feast only seven weeks before, when the elders of Israel beheld God and did eat and drink ! Balak again, in contradistinction to his burnt-offerings, *sacrificed oxen and sheep, and sent to Balaam, and to the princes that were with him.*² A careful consideration of these passages suggests to us that the custom of sacrificial feasts was firmly established at the time of the exodus, and carried with it at least the authority of the patriarch Jacob. There is also great probability that it was subject to grave abuses, of which the licence at Sinai³ and at Shittim⁴ were but examples. But the custom, however originated, was capable of representing a precious reality, and it was therefore taken up into the Divine plan, and made to witness to the Son of God.

The name *peace-offerings* (*shelamim*) applied to these sacrifices occurs first in the words of God to Moses. The occasion was that of the covenant made with Israel on Sinai. The first commands in the Book of the Covenant were concerned with the worship of God, and contained a direction regarding the building of altars. *An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offerings.*⁵ It is interesting to note that the word sacrifice (*zavach*) is here used with reference to burnt-offerings as well as to peace-offerings, while in the account of the ratification of the covenant the distinction is preserved between *offering* the one and *sacrificing* the other.⁶ After this time we read frequently of peace-offerings. The word always occurs in the plural, *shelamim* not *shelem*. The allied verb is variously rendered in the Authorized Version by the words "to be ended, to be finished, to prosper, to make amends, to pay, to perform, to recompense, to repay, to requite, to make restitution, to restore, to reward". The adjective is sometimes rendered "whole," or "full" and sometimes "perfect". It is connected with the word *shalom*, "peace". The application of this name then to the sacrificial meals of the Israelites would draw away their thoughts from any gross ideas which might have gathered around them, as if the animals had been slain to make a meal for God ; and fix their attention more upon the symbolism of a finished work, a price paid, a restoration effected, a peace and fellowship enjoyed. The Septuagint renders *shelamim* by *εἰρηνικά* and *θυσία σωτηρίου*, and *zavach* by *θυσία*.

¹ Exod. xxxii. 6.² Num. xxii. 40 with xxiii. 3.³ Exod. xxxii. 25.⁴ Num. xxv. 2 ; so also alas ! in later days, Prov. vii. 14.⁵ Exod. xx. 24.⁶ *Ib.* xxiv. 5.

THE SACRIFICE.

The term *peace-offerings* includes all that was necessary to furnish that feast where the worshipper sat, as it were, at God's board, in the enjoyment of fellowship with Him. The *sacrifice* of peace-offerings was more strictly the victim by which the necessary work was completed, and price paid, and restoration effected, upon the enjoyment of which benefits the worshipper then entered. With this sacrifice of peace-offerings rather than with the feast that followed it the regulations in the third chapter of Leviticus are concerned. There are several expressions in the chapter¹ which tacitly assume the fact of preparation for a sacrificial meal, but the purpose of the oracle is the regulation of the sacrifice itself.

We have already mentioned the occasions on which an Israelite worshipper might bring his oblation as a sacrifice of peace-offerings, as being for thanksgiving, or as a freewill offering, or in fulfilment of a vow.² As a vow or freewill offering the oblation might take the form either of a burnt-offering or of peace-offerings. The choice would be determined, as we have already remarked when speaking of the burnt-offering, by the thought which was uppermost in the worshipper's mind. If it were of devotion or consecration, his oblation would naturally be presented as a burnt-offering. If his thought was rather of fellowship and joy in God, it would occur to him to celebrate it by a sacrifice of peace-offerings, particularly when a common act of worship by the family was contemplated. Meanwhile in cases of thanksgiving for public and also for private mercies a sacrifice of peace-offerings was specially prescribed; no doubt because of the festal elements of joy and gladness associated with a common meal. The sacrifice of peace-offerings which was offered for thanksgiving is sometimes called a *sacrifice of thanksgiving* (*zevach todah*),³ or simply *thanksgivings*⁴ (*todoth*). To *sacrifice thanksgiving* in the phrase of Psalm L. 14, 23, and 2 Chron. XXXIII. 16, is to offer a sacrifice of peace-offerings for thanksgiving. It marks the spirit and intention of the offerer, and is not equivalent to such a phrase as *render thanksgiving*.⁵ In Psalm LXIX. 30, 31, David says that God will prefer a psalm to a sacrifice as an expression of thanksgiving. In the same way *the sacrifices of strife*⁶ means a sacrificial feast which is not

¹ Verses 11, 16, 17.² Lev. VII. 15, 16.³ *Ib.* XXII. 29; Ps. CVII. 22; CXVI. 17.⁴ Amos IV. 5; Jer. XVII. 26; XXXIII. 11; 2 Chron. XXIX. 31.⁵ Ps. LVI. 12.⁶ Prov. XVII. 1.

the outcome of peace enjoyed through the sense of God's blessing, but a mere formal observance of the sacrificial feast with no underlying reality. *Sacrifices of righteousness* (Ps. IV. 5 ; LI. 19), *of joy* (Ps. XXVII. 6), and *of a broken spirit* (Ps. LI. 17) all refer to the condition of heart and mind of those who bring their oblation of peace-offerings, and not to that which they offer. It is noticeable that we do not meet with the phrase *sacrifice of prayer*, because the idea of a *zevach* is not connected with the act of prayer, but it is intimately connected with the emotions of the worshipper, such as devotion or thankfulness or joy or humility, or with his righteous thoughts and purposes. Thank-offerings then were by no means the only form but rather a special and leading variety of peace-offerings ; and this will account for the occurrence of such phraseology as *sacrifices and thanksgivings*,¹ or again, *sacrifices of peace-offerings and of thanksgiving*.²

We may then picture the pious Israelite coming with a recollection of his own unworthiness indeed, but with a true heart and a lively sense of God's loving kindness and tender mercies, and accompanied by his family, into the house and presence of God. He comes publicly to declare God's Name in the midst of his brethren, and in the midst of the assembly to praise Him. He brings his oblation, and he purposes by means of it to enjoy with his family a time of social fellowship in the presence of God.

Here then he is met with a voice from God telling him how this must be done, a voice calling out of the tent of meeting, and bidding Moses speak to the children of Israel and say to them, *If his oblation be a sacrifice of peace-offerings ; if he offer of the herd, whether male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before Jehovah*. Here, as before, we meet with various alternatives, the oblation being taken either from the herd (vv. 1-5), or from the sheep (vv. 6-11), or from the goats (vv. 12-17). The omission of birds is no doubt owing to their being unsuitable to furnish the sacrificial feast. Separate regulations for the sheep and the goats are necessary because of the use of the fat in this offering. *The fat tail* of the Syrian sheep must find separate mention amongst those parts which were to be removed from the body of the victim for burning upon the altar.³ The alternative offerings from sheep or goats were probably allowed to meet the needs of the less wealthy, or of smaller parties of worshippers. But we

¹ 2 Chron. XXIX. 31.² *Ib.* XXXIII. 16.³ Verse 9.

shall again confine ourselves to a study of the chief sacrifice. We notice then first of all that, unlike the burnt-offerings, these sacrifices might be *male or female* animals, whether they were chosen from the herd or flock. This at once suggests that the emphasis in this offering lies elsewhere than on the absolutely ideal character of the victim; but at the same time the general principle that it shall be *without blemish* is retained. This principle, we must always remember, is important not only from reverential considerations, though these of course are present,¹ but much more from the necessity of preserving a general likeness to Him in whom is no sin or shortcoming. As, however, the ideal perfection of the victim is not a main feature of the likeness to be presented by this form of offering, the rule is not only relaxed to admit of male and female animals, but even to admit of certain specified imperfections in the individuals. The general rule was that the sacrifice must be *perfect to be accepted; there shall be no blemish therein*. *Blind or broken or maimed or having a wen or scurvy or scabbed* must on no account be admitted. However, for a freewill-offering, and apparently for that alone, *a bullock or a lamb that had anything superfluous or lacking in its parts* might be used. But again it is prescribed, and with great emphasis, *that which hath its stones bruised, or crushed or broken or cut, ye shall not offer unto Jehovah*. Such things it is said *have their corruption in them*, which causes a *blemish*, and *they shall not be accepted for you*.² The reason why any relaxation of the rule is allowed is, as we have said, because the perfection of the victim is not the salient feature in the likeness to be presented by this offering. It is not quite so easy to determine why these blemishes were condoned in the case of a freewill-offering but not in the fulfilment of a vow, nor as an offering of thanksgiving. The reason may be that a freewill-offering was a more spontaneous act, not directly connected with any special gift of God, while sacrifices in fulfilment of vows or for thanksgiving would be in acknowledgment of definite mercies received. In the latter case there would be a savour of irreverence in offering an imperfect animal, while in the case of a spontaneous offering God accepts according to what a man has to offer, if indeed that offering is not wholly unsuitable for the purpose. That purpose, we remember in the present case, is not only to furnish a sacrifice on the altar, but to form the basis for a common meal.

¹ Mal. i. 8.

² Lev. xxii. 21-25; cf. the regulations for treating firstlings as peace-offerings; Deut. xv. 19-23; xvii. 1.

The various blemishes which are mentioned as rendering an animal unfit for a sacrifice of peace-offerings are such as decidedly indicate the presence of disease, or at least may be due to disease. On the other hand, anything lacking or superfluous in the parts might well be consistent with its perfect wholesomeness for food. And this we believe to be the reason why, in the case of freewill-offerings, certain imperfections in the victim were admissible. The salient feature of the peace-offerings was the feast which followed the sacrifice. This feast must present a true likeness to the Table of the Lord; and the fellowship of that Table being healthful and profitable for all things, the table of peace-offerings must be spread with wholesome food.

The offering *before Jehovah* we take to be identical in meaning with the fuller expression in the ritual for the burnt-offering, *he shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting that he may be accepted before Jehovah*; and we see once more a likeness to the fact that all who draw near to God and in hope of fellowship with Him do so by means of the Representative and Substitute of men whom God has appointed. The ritual accordingly proceeds:

And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his oblation. The significance of this act in all these offerings we have shown to be that the offerer transferred all his responsibilities before Jehovah to the head of his Substitute and Representative.

And kill it at the door of the tent of meeting. Step by step the ritual follows that of the burnt-offering, showing clearly the identity of reference in the two. Here again then we see a likeness to the life-surrender of the Son of God; who, undertaking our nature and responsibilities, through His own death destroyed death for men.¹ The sacrifice of peace-offerings was to be killed *at the door of the tent of meeting*, that is just within or just without the northern entrance to the court, as in the case of the burnt-offering. The lesser peace-offerings were slain *before the tent of meeting*,² which we take to be the same as *on the side of the altar northward before Jehovah* of the lesser burnt-offerings. The place indicated is the northern area of the court adjacent to the tabernacle and altar.

And Aaron's sons the priests shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. We notice here that the presentation of the blood, which took place in the ritual of burnt-offerings immediately after the slaying of the victim, is now omitted;

¹ Heb. II. 9-18.

² Verses 8, 13.

and that the priests proceed at once to the sprinkling round about upon the altar. This is an indication that the idea of atonement before Jehovah by blood-shedding, which stood, as we believe, in the forefront of animal sacrifice from the beginning, and therefore occupied a prominent position in the complete ritual of the burnt-offering, now recedes for a time into the background. It was the purpose of God to introduce a new and special form of animal sacrifice, to be designated a sin-offering, in which the truth of atonement for sin by blood-shedding was to be particularly emphasized and illustrated. Meanwhile, the original form of sacrifice by burnt-offering, and the practice of sacrificial feasts which had grown up alongside it, were to be appropriated for illustrations of other related aspects of the truth. Accordingly while the bringing near of the blood to God by a simple act of presentation was retained in the chief form of burnt-offering, probably as a primitive custom, it was dropped in the lesser forms of that offering, and altogether in the sacrifices of peace-offerings, and also, as we may here remark, in the trespass-offerings. A whole class of offerings was specially devoted to the expansion and illustration of this central truth, that Christ died to reconcile His Father to us, and accordingly it is passed over here. But the fact that He died, and that His death lay at the basis of all His work for us, is symbolized here, as we have already shown in the preceding chapter, by the sprinkling of blood by the priests upon the altar round about.

And he shall offer—or present, bring near—of (i.e. from) the sacrifice of peace-offerings an offering made by fire unto Jehovah; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys, shall he take away. We come now to the preparation for offering a burnt-offering out of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. As in the case of the burnt-offering it is the offerer himself who prepares this fire-offering.¹ As there he is to cut the whole burnt-offering into its pieces, so here he is himself to separate these parts of his oblation which are to be burned upon the altar. We have already explained this act to be parallel to that of slaying the victim, and significant of the necessity for individual trust in the true Substitute and Representative, and personal application to God through Him. It is true that at first sight this fire-offering seems to be wanting in those two

¹ Heb. *Isheh* from *esh*, fire. The word “is used freely from Exodus to Samuel but not later”. (“O.T. Synonyms”).

particulars of perfection and completeness which we have seen to be characteristic of the burnt-offering. But a closer inspection shows that both these particulars are in fact not only present but specially referred to. If the animal selected for a burnt-offering must be the best of its kind, so that which is taken from this sacrifice to be a burnt-offering must also be the best part. It is certain that *the fat* is regarded as the richest part of the carcass. Indeed in many passages of Scripture *the fat* is a synonym for *the best*; thus the best and finest of the oil, or of wine, or of wheat, is described as their fat.¹ It seems clear, moreover, that the symbolism of this regulation is derived from the current conception and not the reverse, for we find Pharaoh describing the good things of Egypt to Joseph as *the fat of the land*.² The conception is indeed a natural and a common one, and in this regulation it preserves exactly the true characteristic of a burnt-offering. But if this is so, the characteristic of completeness or totality is also present. This no doubt is the reason for the elaborate enumeration of all the parts of the body where fat is to be found; this also the reason for a separate paragraph dealing with the treatment of a sheep whose fat tail was to be taken off *entire, hard by the backbone*; ³ this also the reason for the addition of the words *all the fat is Jehovah's*.⁴ It is clear then that the intention of the separation of the fat in the way prescribed is to prepare for a true burnt-offering.

And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt-offering, which is upon the wood that is on the fire: it is an offering made by fire of a sweet savour unto Jehovah. Here we find the burnt-offering for which due preparation had been made carried out in all particulars according to the ritual which we considered in the last chapter. The direction that it is to be burnt *upon the burnt-offering* refers no doubt, to the presence upon the altar of the continual daily burnt-offering.⁵ The fat of the peace-offerings was to be turned into smoke and vapour upon this, no doubt to emphasize the identity of reference in the two. In the language which is here used we recognize the *ascent* of the fat *upon the burnt-offering which is upon the wood that is on the fire*. In this way it becomes like the burnt-offering an odour of rest unto Jehovah. We notice finally one more point of correspondence between the fire-offering of the fat and the regular burnt-offering. We have already remarked in the preceding chapter that meal- and

¹ Num. xviii. 12, 29, 30, 32; Deut. xxxii. 14; Ps. lxxxi. 16.

² Gen. xlv. 18.

³ Verse 9.

⁴ Verse 16.

⁵ Exod. xxix. 38-42.

drink-offerings always accompanied the burnt-offering ; in the same way they were regularly attached to sacrifices of peace-offerings.¹ This is no doubt because the fire-offering of the fat was indeed an *'olah*, and with this final mark of identity the correspondence is complete.

The identity which we have established between these offerings proves that the sacrifice of peace-offerings is indeed made in the likeness of Christ, as we have shown the burnt-offering to be. We are thus prepared to see in all that takes place subsequently in connection with this sacrificial victim a likeness to some important feature in the work of the Son of God.

But now our attention is drawn to a remarkable variation of phraseology in the ritual for the lesser sacrifices of peace-offerings. The special phraseology which we have been considering, and which seems intended to identify the *zevach shelamim* with the *'olah* is modified, and instead we read,

The priest shall burn it upon the altar ; it is the food (Heb. bread) *of the fire-offering unto Jehovah ;*² and again, *The priest shall burn them upon the altar ; it is the food of the fire-offering for a sweet savour ; all the fat is Jehovah's.*³ These words connect the sacrifice with the feast that is about to follow it, and declare that God Himself shares in that feast. The fat is the bread of Jehovah and the rest is the bread of His people. Whatever truth there was in current conceptions of fellowship with objects of worship by means of a sacrificial meal is here fully appropriated and sanctioned ; but whatever was gross and unworthy is expressly excluded. The Israelite was not for a moment allowed to think that he fed his God. The animals to be used in the sacrifice were carefully prescribed to him, the raising of parts of these to God was taken entirely out of the hands of the man himself, and put into the hands of a priestly body who are sharply distinguished from himself. In Leviticus XXI. 6, 8, 17, 21 this prerogative of the priests is spoken of with special emphasis ; but it is already sufficiently marked in the sacrificial ritual. Once more it is made plain to the Israelite that he is not at liberty to present to his God through the priests what he himself may select. On the contrary, Jehovah declares what is His, and what He grants to those who hold fellowship with Him. In these and other ways it was impressed upon the Israelite that it was he who was admitted to the Table of God, and not the reverse. He was fed by the

¹ Num. xv. 1-16.

² Verse 11.

³ Verse 16.

bounty of God, God was not fed by his offerings. And indeed this truth, not always obvious to the unenlightened man in this or any age, was impressed also upon the Israelite in his daily life at home, and not only at times of sacrificial feasts. *It shall be a perpetual statute throughout your generations in all your dwellings that ye shall eat neither fat nor blood.*¹ Their daily food then, no less than the food of their sacrificial feasts, was given to them by God; then as always they were recipients of His bounty alone. During the wilderness life every meal of flesh was intended to be a sacrament of fellowship with God. Every animal slain for food must be brought to the tabernacle as a sacrifice of peace-offerings, and received back from the hands of God through His priests, the offerer being thus assured by the acceptance of the blood and of the fat that he had fellowship with Him.² During the sad years of penal wandering, when so much was in abeyance, this rule was indeed not observed.³ And when the entry into the promised land took place it was plainly impossible of observance, but at the same time it was provided that at all times when animal food was enjoyed the rites of the sanctuary should be kept in remembrance.⁴ Those rites have shown that access to God is by means of a Substitute and Representative, and they are about to show that fellowship with God is enjoyed in the person of this Representative. The likeness to the fact of our access to God in the Person of His Son is too plain to be overlooked; and we shall find as we proceed that the necessity for preserving a true correspondence between the Victim and the Person represented by it governs all the regulations for dealing with the flesh of this sacrifice.

THE BREAD OF GOD.

We have come in our study to the first occurrence of this phrase in Scripture. The fire-offering taken from the sacrifice of peace-offerings is described as *the bread of the fire-offering unto Jehovah*;⁵ and later in this same book we read of *the bread of their God*⁶ being taken from the sacrifices of peace-offerings of the Israelites. The exact reference of the phrase must then be gathered from its meaning in these places; and we take it to be an indication of the fact that in the access of men to God both men and God find satisfaction in the same thing. The fat of the victim is the bread of God, and the remainder of the same victim is the bread of His people. The

¹ Verse 17.

⁴ *Ib.* 20-28.

² Lev. xvii. 1-7.

⁵ Lev. iii. 11.

³ Deut. xii. 8.

⁶ *Ib.* xxii. 25.

latter phrase, it is true, does not actually occur in the ritual law, nor do we think that the idea of sustenance to be drawn from the flesh of the victim is prominent in the symbolism. That truth was reserved for a later stage of the revelation, and here remains still in the background, though ready to step out into the light. Rather do we believe that the victim is regarded as the ground, nay the very substance of peace with God enjoyed by man. He *is* our peace. Men are here represented as in the full enjoyment of a completed work, and filled with satisfaction through the agent in that work of restoration. But in this satisfaction God Himself shares. He too is satisfied, and satisfied with the same object. The fire-offering is His food also, but in the sense of being to Him *for a savour of rest*.¹ Fellowship with God is enjoyed by men through the possession of a common ground of satisfaction. Both are filled, though in different ways, with the same satisfaction. It is nothing to the purpose that in later days the carnal Israelites took these words in a gross and carnal sense;² the important thing is to ascertain the sense in which they were used by God Himself, and this we believe to be that God found satisfaction no less than men, and indeed together with men, in their Representative and Substitute. It is worthy of notice as supporting this interpretation that not only the fire-offering from the peace-offerings but the regular burnt-offering also is termed the bread of God;³ and in Leviticus XXI., where the phrase frequently occurs, it undoubtedly includes the fire-offering of the burnt-offering.⁴ Now we know that the burnt-offering was solely *enjoyed*—if we may so speak—by God. To Him it was a savour of rest like bread which strengthens man's heart. In this sense accordingly we interpret here *the bread of God*. May we not then see in the fact that the fat was first offered upon the altar before men sat down to the feast of peace-offerings a further correspondence with the reality? The true Representative of men not only lived and died and rose again, but also ascended to the Presence of God, before men were summoned to the enjoyment of His completed work. The savour of rest first rises to Jehovah, and then the good tidings of peace is preached to all the world.

Before we leave this subject, however, there are two passages which call for some comment and explanation. The first is in Leviticus XXI. 22, where we read that the priest *eats the bread of his God*. The meaning of this expression is that

¹ Verse 16.² Ps. L. 7-15.³ Num. XXVIII. 2, 24.⁴ E.g. verse 21.

certain portions of the offerings which were designated to be turned into vapour and smoke upon the altar, and so were properly "the bread of God," were *reserved from the fire*¹ and eaten by the priests. In this sense they ate the bread of their God. If the priest himself were the offerer nothing was reserved, but the whole burnt upon the altar,² showing plainly that God gave to the priest a portion of that which properly belonged to Himself.

The second passage is in Ezekiel XLIV. 7, where we find the words, *ye offer My bread, the fat and the blood*. This makes the blood as well as the fat to be the bread of God, which seems to militate against what has been written above; for we have shown in a former chapter that the blood was not placed upon the altar-fires, and is not a fire-offering of sweet savour; how can it then be included with the fat in the bread of God, consistently with the explanation which we have just given of this expression? We believe that there lies in these words an important truth, and the suggestion of a fact which could not be entirely omitted in a complete representation of the offering of Himself by the Son of God. We call attention first of all to the word *offer*, which is in the original "to present" or "bring near"; and the same word occurs again in verse 15 in the same connection. We know that both fat and blood were presented, but in different ways; one was turned into smoke and vapour on the altar, the other was lifted in a bowl towards the sanctuary, or displayed upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, or taken within and sprinkled there before the veil and mercy-seat and put upon the horns of the altar of incense. But the blood was not only brought near in this way, it was also taken to the altar and poured out at its base, or sprinkled round about it. These two elements of every offering were thus reserved to God, and were brought near to Him by the priests. But we cannot think that their reservation to God exhausts the meaning of their being termed the bread of God. It seems clear from what has been said above that we must look for some sense in which even the blood poured out at the base of or upon the altar was a savour of rest to God, and a grateful offering. That blood in that position had then, as we believe, a double significance. From one point of view it was, as we have seen in a former chapter, the token of a penal death having been suffered. This penal death indeed lay at the base of the whole work of consecration carried on upon the altar.

¹ Num. xviii. 9; Lev. vii. 35.

² *Ib.* vi. 23.

This aspect of the blood was present to the mind of God, but in no sense as a savour of rest to Him. We may be quite sure from Scripture that if men could have obtained life in any other way, the Father would not have spared His son to die.¹ If Isaiah could proclaim that *it pleased Jehovah to bruise Him*² it was not in the sense that God took pleasure in laying our iniquities upon His head. He who takes no pleasure in the death of a sinner, can He find any pleasure in the death of a sinless One, especially if that sinless One be His only beloved Son? No indeed, He could not do so when that death was viewed as the stroke of penal judgment. But the dying of His only beloved Son in pursuance of the Father's plan of mercy; the love which His own Son showed to sinful men in willingly laying down His life for their sakes; the steadfastness with which He resisted unto blood, testifying to the truth and striving against sin, were these things not an element in that death, full of the deepest satisfaction to the mind of God, and indeed of a piece with His whole life of consecration, of love, of testimony? If St. Paul's martyrdom could be compared to the libation of a drink-offering,³ how much more the martyrdom of Christ! This is the second aspect in which the blood upon the altar might be viewed. As the token of penal death, which is the leading aspect in the law as in the Gospel, the blood was not a sweet savour; but as a token of obedience unto death, even cross-death,⁴ it was equally with the fire-offering the bread of God. This aspect of the case, although scarcely in view in the ritual law, is not allowed to escape notice altogether, but finds distinct mention by the Holy Spirit through the prophet Ezekiel.

It is of interest, however, to note that there are some indications of the truth in the ritual law itself. The prohibition of eating blood is generally connected with its use in making atonement,⁵ that is to say, with its aspect as representing a penal death. But there is also a prohibition against eating blood in connection with the law of the fire-offering in the sacrifice of peace-offerings.⁶ It has just been said that all the fat is the bread of God for a sweet savour to Him; and it is immediately added that the Israelites shall eat *neither fat nor blood*, where we should have expected merely a prohibition against eating fat. There seems to be a tacit assumption that the blood is in some sense the bread of God equally with the fat, and for this reason also it is prohibited to the Israelite,

¹ Gal. III. 21; II. 21.² Is. LIII. 10.³ Phil. II. 17; 2 Tim. IV. 6.⁴ Phil. II. 8; Heb. II. 9.⁵ Lev. XVII. 10, 11.⁶ *Ib.* III. 17.

as well as because of its well-known use in making atonement. And there is a passage in Deuteronomy which seems clearly to include the blood in the burnt-offering. Moses speaks to the Israelites in these words: *Thou shalt make thy burnt-offerings, the flesh and the blood, upon the altar of Jehovah thy God, and the blood of thy sacrifices* (i.e. sacrifices of peace-offerings) *shall be poured out upon the altar of Jehovah thy God, and thou shalt eat the flesh.*¹ If we take these words in their plain and literal sense, they undoubtedly include the blood as well as the flesh in the burnt-offering, though they fall short of saying what would have been incorrect, that the blood was burned with the flesh upon the altar. The burnt-offering is "made" ('*asah*')² with the flesh and with the blood, one is burnt and the other is only presented and sprinkled, but yet *the flesh and the blood is the burnt-offering*. The Septuagint translators seem to have felt a difficulty, for they translate, *Thou shalt make* (ποιήσεις)² *thy whole-burnt-offerings, thou shalt offer* (ἀνολίσεις) *the flesh upon the altar of the Lord thy God, but the blood of thy sacrifices thou shalt pour out at the foot of the altar of the Lord thy God, but the flesh thou shalt eat*. The suggestion of the Hebrew original that the blood formed part of the burnt-offering disappears entirely in this translation. We believe, however, that Moses understood what he was saying, and that the Holy Spirit who guided him in writing had a purpose in this form of expression, which He defined more clearly by the prophet Ezekiel, so that a notice of the satisfaction of God in the obedience unto death of the representative victim might not be wanting from the ritual law. We have endeavoured to discover the true meaning of the words *the bread of God* as applied to the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings by an examination of all the passages where they occur; and in the course of our enquiry we have come across one more point in which the language of sacrifice reveals a likeness to the Son of God. It is not merely the fact that the obedience of the Son of God to the point of death and in the act of dying finds particular recognition there, but a finer correspondence still which commands our admiration. In the law of Moses the penal aspect of the victim's death fills the foreground of the picture, while its aspect as an act of uttermost obedience, although present, is in the shade. The relative position of the two aspects in the sacrificial law is proportioned to the place which each respectively holds in the Gospel of the Son of God.

¹ Deut. xii. 27.² On these words see "O.T. Synonyms".

THE FEAST.

We have seen that the sacrifice of peace-offerings is a true burnt-offering by which the work of acceptance is completed on behalf of the worshipper; we have also seen that an indication is given of the share which God Himself takes in the gladness of fellowship re-established. We now turn to see the worshipper in the enjoyment of fellowship with God. This is pictured by a feast upon the sacrifice which had been offered; and here we shall consider (1) the preparation of the Israelite; (2) the materials, (3) the place, and (4) the time of the feast.

1. As regards the preparation of the Israelite he was obliged to be ceremonially clean. *As for the flesh, every one that is clean shall eat thereof; but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, that pertain unto Jehovah, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from his people. And when anyone shall touch any unclean thing, the uncleanness of man, or an unclean beast, or any unclean abomination, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which pertain unto Jehovah, that soul shall be cut off from his people.*¹ Such a rule was no doubt in accordance with ancient custom,² as well as with natural instincts. But this does not detract from its significance in this connection. The condition for the enjoyment of fellowship with God is separation from the defilement of sin. *The sacrifice of the wicked*, that is, the whole sacrificial observance of the man who does not separate himself from sin, *is an abomination to Jehovah*,³ and that soul shall be cut off from his people. It must always have been recognized that the purification of the person before approach to God bore a moral significance; but the distinctions between things clean and unclean which were imposed upon the Israelites at Sinai were expressly designed to keep ever before their minds the sacredness of their calling and the holiness of the God whom they served. *Ye shall be holy unto Me, for I Jehovah am holy, and have set you apart from the peoples, that ye should be Mine.*⁴ The preparation of the Israelite then for the sacrificial feast by means of ceremonial purification must have continually reminded him of this necessary condition of fellowship with God. The regulation is true to the eternal principle that *if we say that we have fellowship with God, and walk in the darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; but if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one*

¹ Lev. vii. 19-21.² Prov. xv. 8; xxi. 27.³ Gen. xxxv. 2; Exod. xix. 10, 14, 15.⁴ Lev. xx. 22-26.

*with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin.*¹

2. As regards the materials for the feast, we give a literal translation of the only rule which there seems to be upon the subject.² *This is the law of a sacrifice of peace-offerings which one shall offer unto Jehovah. If on-the-ground-of a thanksgiving he offer it, then he shall offer in-addition-to the sacrifice (i.e. the ox, sheep, etc., of ch. III.) of thanksgiving perforated-cakes, unleavened ones, mixed with oil, and thin unleavened cakes anointed with oil, and fine flour well-mixed (even or made into) perforated-cakes mixed with oil; together-with perforated-cakes of leavened (lit. sour) bread shall he offer his offering in-addition-to the thanksgiving sacrifice of his peace-offerings.* These words appear to be applicable only to a sacrifice for thanksgiving; but if so, there are no corresponding directions for the sacrifices in fulfilment of vows or as freewill-offerings. This seems on the face of it unlikely; and we believe that the words are intended to convey the necessary guidance for every form of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. The wording is admittedly somewhat obscure, and the variations in the Septuagint version do not make it clearer. Four kinds of offering seem to be enumerated: (1) unleavened cakes mingled with oil; (2) wafers anointed with oil; (3) cakes mingled with oil of fine flour well-mixed, whether leavened or unleavened it is not stated; (4) cakes of leavened bread. We believe, however, that only three kinds are intended, and that the fourth is really a supplementary description of the third. It states that the cakes of the third class should in the case of a thanksgiving offering be of leavened bread, implying that in other cases they should be like the other two classes without leaven. We shall thus be left with three kinds of offerings as the ordinary accompaniments of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, namely, cakes of two sorts and wafers, all the cakes and wafers being mixed with or anointed with oil, and also without leaven; except in the case of a sacrifice of thanksgiving when one sort of cakes were leavened. This result is confirmed by its correspondence with the directions for similar offerings in connection with the ram of consecration at the consecration of Aaron. The ritual of the ram of consecration was the model for the future ritual of peace-offerings,³ as we have already remarked when speaking of that service. Now the offerings in connection with the ram were of three kinds, and three only, namely, *unleavened*

¹ 1 John I. 6, 7; cf. 1 Cor. v. 6-8.

² Lev. VII, II-13.

³ Exod. XXIX, 26-28.

*bread, and cakes unleavened mingled with oil, and wafers unleavened anointed with oil.*¹ These then we believe to have been the ordinary constituents of the peace-offerings feast, with the sole exception that leaven was present in one kind of cake at a sacrifice of thanksgiving. We may here express our conviction that wine also formed a part of these offerings, although it is not expressly mentioned. The omission of any distinct reference to wine may be compared to its omission in the law of the meal-offering, and of the shewbread, and, even a closer parallel, in the law of the passover feast. In this last we read only of unleavened bread and bitter herbs, yet we know from the New Testament, as well as from Jewish tradition and custom, that wine was upon the table. So we believe it to have been in every feast upon a sacrifice of peace-offerings. The three recognized staples of Israelite diet, grain, and wine, and oil,² were then the proper accompaniments of the feast of peace-offerings.

It is important to understand the real nature of these offerings. Although they consisted, like the meal-offerings, of prepared grain, and wine, and oil, they are distinguished from meal-offerings by at least two particulars. In all the meal-offerings of the people a portion was burnt upon the altar, and the remainder was given to the priests. In these offerings, on the other hand, none was burnt upon the altar,³ and what remained, after the heave-offering had been abstracted, was given to the offerer. It will be remembered also that a meal-offering had already been presented with the sacrifice which had been made upon the altar. These offerings must then be considered simply as the materials for the feast of fellowship presented to God for His acceptance and use. But it is expressly stipulated that the worshipper shall bring the whole to the altar of God, and that *from it he shall bring near one out of each oblation for a heave-offering unto Jehovah ; it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace-offerings.*⁴ The priest, receiving one of each of the three kinds of offering, elevates it in his hands in token that the whole is submitted for the use of Jehovah in the service which He has ordained. He then retains what he has elevated as a pledge that Jehovah has accepted the oblations, and that henceforward, though brought by man, they are used by God, and may be regarded as His provision at His Table.

¹ Exod. xxix. 2.

² Deut. xviii. 4 ; Hos. ii. 8 ; Joel ii. 19 ; Neh. x. 39.

³ What is described in Exod. xxix. 23-25 is different from an ordinary sacrifice of peace-offerings by the people ; in this case what ordinarily formed the officiating priest's portion is burnt,

⁴ Lev. vii. 14.

We pause here to say a few words on the term *heave-offering* (Heb. *terumah*). The use of this word in Scripture will, we believe, confirm the interpretation which we have just given to it in the present connection. It occurs first in the original with reference to the offerings of materials for the tabernacle,¹ and again with reference to the half-shekel paid towards the expenses of the tabernacle.² It is also applied to the spoil of the Midianites which was appropriated for the same purpose,³ and for similar dedications in the time of Ezra.⁴ In Numbers XVIII. 8 the word is used as inclusive of *all the hallowed things of the children of Israel*, such as tithes, first-fruits, and any offering which was dedicated to the service of God. We believe then that its use in the present connection denotes that these offerings are presented to God for His use in the symbolic representation of fellowship with Himself which He had instituted.

A further question remains before we leave this part of our subject, and that is why leaven was generally excluded from the feast of fellowship, but was admitted in one case? As regards the general exclusion of leaven from the sacrificial feast, in the mind of the Israelite it must have connected that feast with the feast of the passover, and therefore also the victim of that sacrifice with the lamb of the passover. This in itself was no insignificant effect of this regulation. It brought home to the pious and thoughtful Israelite the consideration that although forms of sacrifice might be multiplied, they all converged upon one central fact of redemption. But this leads us to ask why leaven was excluded from the passover feast? We believe that leaven was always regarded as the result of processes of decomposition or corruption. Certainly in the New Testament it is used by our Lord as a figure of the corrupt influence of false teaching and example,⁵ a meaning which many have thought to be present even in the parable of leaven hid in three measures of meal. St. Paul also compares the presence of malice and wickedness in the heart, or of gross sin in the church, to leaven.⁶ We can scarcely be wrong then in interpreting leaven as a symbol of corruption, and specially of the corruption of sin. But the lamb of the passover feast was made in many respects like the true Paschal Lamb, as we have already noted in a former chapter, and as St. John in his Gospel tells us.⁷ And amongst these points of likeness was the provision that the lamb should be

¹ Exod. xxv. 2.² *Ib.* xxx. 13.³ Num. xxxi. 29.⁴ Ezra viii. 25.⁵ Matt. xvi. 12; Luke xii. 1.⁶ 1 Cor. v. 6-8.⁷ John xix. 36.

without blemish, and that its flesh should be preserved from contamination or from corruption by that which remained being burned with fire.¹ These conditions were imposed so that the lamb might bear some true likeness to the Christ in His total freedom from the corruption of sin. The exclusion of leaven from the passover table is intended still further to emphasize this truth. If the bitter herbs were symbolic of the bitter experiences of Him who died that the true Israel might be redeemed, the very bread which was eaten with the sacrificed lamb must also bear a likeness to Him in its freedom from taint of corruption. We are confirmed in this interpretation by the knowledge that our Lord Jesus took this very unleavened bread from the passover table and made it afresh in the likeness of Himself. He took it and brake it, and said, *This is My Body which is broken for you.* Leaven was therefore excluded from the passover feast because all the materials of the feast were, each in their measure, made like the Son of God. We cannot refrain from remarking that Israelites redeemed by the blood of this incorrupt lamb themselves ate unleavened bread for a complete cycle of days; even as our interest in the sacrifice of the pure Saviour involves us in a continual obligation to purity. If unleavened bread represented Him, we too are called to purge out the old leaven, and keep our feast of unleavened bread. All this St. Paul has plainly expressed.² But if this is the plain meaning of the exclusion of leaven from the feast of the passover, it is also the Divine intention in the exclusion of leavened bread from the feast on the sacrifice of peace-offerings. In the sacrifice of peace-offerings we find the same precautions against blemish in the victim, and against contamination or corruption of the flesh, and in harmony with these regulations, and bearing the same symbolic reference, there is a general rule excluding leaven from the concomitants of the feast.

But if all this is so, why was leaven admitted to the table in the sacrifice for thanksgiving? We may remark that its admission in this case must have suggested to the dullest mind that the general prohibition of leaven was due to its symbolic reference; and not to any inherent uncleanness in the substance itself. We must remember also that while the prohibition was relaxed as regards one of the three offerings, and leavened cakes substituted for unleavened, yet for the other two kinds unleavened cakes and wafers were still

¹ Exod. xii. 5, 10.

² 1 Cor. v. 6-8.

required, so that the same general principle is present. But, we may ask, why is it relaxed at all? It is certainly interesting to observe, what we shall very soon discuss in detail, that in this special form of sacrifice the relaxation of a general rule here is followed at once by extra stringency in another general rule; the two exceptions, as it were, balancing and neutralizing one another; but not only so, they serve also to draw attention to this rule and to that; as if both the rules were of some special symbolic importance. If it had not been for these peculiar exceptions in this one kind of peace-offerings, we might indeed have overlooked two remarkable and intentional likenesses to the Son of God in this law of the peace-offerings. But if an exception in this respect was to be introduced, why should it be introduced in the sacrifice for thanksgivings, and not in one of the other two forms of sacrifices of peace-offerings? This question is not perhaps one on which we can give an answer with confidence. We remember that victims offered as freewill-offerings or as vows might be presented either as burnt-offerings or as peace-offerings. It is just possible that their occasional connection with burnt-offerings, a ruling characteristic of which was purity, might influence their ritual even when offered as peace-offerings, and exempt them from any exception which introduced an element of corruption. But it is more likely that the reason is to be sought in the connection of sacrifices of thanksgiving with the offering of first-fruits. The subject of first-fruits is an interesting one. There were two offerings of first-fruits on behalf of the people. The first was on the second day of unleavened bread, the morrow after that first day which was kept as a Sabbath, and the third day from that on which the passover was killed. On this day the first sheaf of barley harvest was waved, *and ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched grain, nor fresh ears, until this selfsame day, until ye have brought the oblation of your God.*¹ The second was on the fiftieth day, reckoning from the day of the wave-sheaf at the feast of Pentecost, when a new meal-offering of two wave-loaves baked with leaven was presented on behalf of the people for first-fruits to Jehovah.² It is important to notice that while only a burnt-offering accompanied the wave-sheaf, where leaven was absent, in the latter case, where leaven is present, there are not only burnt-offerings, but also a sin-offering, as it were to counteract the presence of the leaven. There are also, and this should specially be noticed in connection with our present enquiry, two he-lambs for a

¹ Lev. XXIII. 9-14.

² *Ib.* 15-20.

sacrifice of peace-offerings. The two loaves of bread of the first-fruits are to be waved for a wave-offering before Jehovah *with the two lambs*. It is then the sacrifice of peace-offerings which is specially connected with the heave-offerings or wave-offerings¹ of first-fruits. Besides these national offerings of first-fruits, the people themselves brought first-fruits of *all that was in their land*,² the oil, the vintage, grain, and honey,³ as well as the firstlings of their flocks and herds. These first-fruits, in the case of bread, were of the bread ordinarily in use, and so like the two wave-loaves of first-fruits were baked with leaven. The presentation of these offerings was the occasion no doubt of sacrifices of peace-offerings and such festal occasions as are described in Deut. XII., for the sacrifices connected with *the tithes and the heave-offering of their hand*⁴ would naturally be sacrifices of thanksgiving. We may then assume that a special connexion existed between sacrifices of thanksgiving and offerings of first-fruits, and as we know that both leaven and honey were brought as first-fruits,⁵ a reason appears for the admission of leaven in some form to the sacrificial feast of this offering. Meanwhile, as we have already remarked, this circumstance is made the opportunity for drawing attention to significant points in the symbolism, and also for pointing out the meaning of that symbolism, as we shall soon more clearly see.⁶

3. We have spent some time over the subject of the materials for the feast, but we have not yet considered the regulations for the use of the sacrificial flesh. Some of these will come before us as we consider the place and the time of the celebration, others will be considered later. As regards the place where the sacrificial feast was to be eaten there are no precise directions. During the sojourn in the wilderness, where animal food was not so plentiful, and at a time when the people were with difficulty restrained from idolatrous practices, every ox or lamb or goat slain for food was to be brought first to the tabernacle as a sacrifice of peace-offerings, at least this was the ideal regulation.⁷ This seems to imply that the flesh, carefully guarded no doubt from ceremonial defilement, was taken back to the tent to be consumed. In Deuteronomy,⁸ in prospect of entry into the promised land, this rule is modified. The flesh of

¹ The terms are practically identical, see e.g. Num. XVIII. 11.

² *Ib.* XVIII. 11-13.

³ Lev. II. 12.

⁴ Deut. XII. 11, 17.

⁵ Lev. II. 12.

⁶ In Amos iv. 5 the prophet asserts that the Israelites *burn* (i.e. *burn on the altar*, *kathar*) a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened; see Lev. II. 12.

⁷ Lev. XVII. 1-7.

⁸ Ch. XII.

sacrificial animals might be eaten in any place by clean and unclean persons without distinction, only with due recollection of the rites of the sanctuary by pouring out the blood upon the ground. The sacrificial feast was to take place only *in the place which Jehovah their God should choose, to cause His name to dwell there*. In that place, with son and daughter, manservant and maidservant, and dependant Levite, they should eat their sacrifices before Jehovah with joy. The note of joy and gladness pervades this feast. Sin had been atoned for, and acceptance secured; the cheering light of the countenance of Jehovah was upon them; His presence was assured to them. They sat down under His shadow with great delight, and His fruit was sweet to their taste. This surely is made in the likeness of the Gospel feast, whose message is, Come, for all things are now ready.

4. We come now to the regulations for the time of celebration of the feast of peace-offerings. This is given in the following words: *The flesh of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings for thanksgiving shall be eaten on the day of his oblation; he shall not leave any of it until the morning. But if the sacrifice of his oblation be a vow, or a freewill-offering, it shall be eaten on the day that he offereth his sacrifice; and on the morrow that which remaineth of it shall be eaten; but that which remaineth of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day shall be burnt with fire. And if any of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace-offerings be eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it; it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity.*¹ We see here that the sacrifices of peace-offerings for a vow or freewill-offering were to be eaten on the first or on the second day, while that for thanksgiving must be eaten on the first day. Anything that remained over after the appointed time for the feast was to be burned up with fire; and furthermore these regulations were of such importance that neglect of them nullified the whole service. We have seen that anything that remained after the passover feast was to be burned upon the same day;² and the law would naturally be understood by the Israelites as designed to protect the flesh of the victim from defilement or other desecration. But in the case of peace-offerings permission is given to keep the flesh over two days, by which some risk of desecration would be run. It is true that the flesh was to be guarded against contact with defilement, and if it touched any unclean thing it was not to be eaten, but to be burned up at

¹ Lev, vii, 15-18,

² Exod, xii, 10; xxiii, 18,

once.¹ But the change from the passover rule showed that in the sacrifice of peace-offerings something more than protection from external defilement was in view. The Israelite may indeed have considered that the extension of time in which the sacrificial meal might be enjoyed was merely a concession to his convenience. But yet, on the other hand, he must have noticed that this extension of time was strictly limited, and that while it was allowed for a vow or freewill-offering it was not allowed for a sacrifice of thanksgiving. It would be natural to connect the limitation of the time to two days with a desire to protect the flesh from danger of decomposition; and this connection was made more probable by the fact that the solitary case in which extension of time was not allowed was precisely the case in which the law had just sanctioned the presence of leaven on the festal table. The admission of the symbol of corruption for a special reason in the bread of the feast called for special stringency in the rule which guarded the flesh from corruption; if indeed an emphasis was intended not only upon the need for ceremonial purity in the flesh of the victim, but also upon its freedom from the corruption of decomposition. This we may believe the thoughtful Israelite to have perceived. But he may have wondered why such vehemence of language was used, if this was the whole account of the matter. Why was it not sufficient to say that what remained of the flesh must be burned up on the third day, so as to guard against any possibility of its defilement by corruption? Why was it necessary to reiterate the warnings, *it shall not be accepted, it shall not be imputed unto him that offereth it, it shall be an abomination, the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity*, if any feast upon the peace-offerings took place upon the third day? Why indeed? It must have been hard for the Israelite to give an answer, but for that very reason it became to him a test of faith, and so a means of grace. But for us, far down the stream of revelation as we are, it is not hard to see the reason for the whole. We have found reason to believe that the victim of the peace-offerings is made like the incarnate Son of God. When the dead animal was no longer able to be a picture of the living Mediator, the priest was joined with it to complete the likeness. But still the dead animal remains in the symbol; and it is to be used to illustrate further truths concerning the work and office of the Son of God. And in the mind of Him Who was manipulating these symbols the victim continuing in this condition presented a fatal unlikeness to His Son. The

¹ Lev, vii, 19,

death of the animal and the presence of its corpse was indeed no mistake, for His Son was to die upon the cross, and His corpse was to be taken down from the tree and laid in a tomb. But that tomb was to be a new tomb, in which no dead man had ever before been laid; if then the corpse of the sacrificial victim touched any unclean thing its likeness to the incarnate Son was lost, and it was discarded and burnt with fire. But more than this, it was the purpose of the Father that His Holy One should not see corruption,¹ and should rise again from the dead upon the third day. It is to the illustration of this truth that this whole symbolism which we are considering tends. Must the medium of man's fellowship with God be a dead animal, then at least it shall see no corruption, and never under any circumstances shall it be allowed to continue in existence in that state of death beyond the third day? If either of these things took place, the picture would be untrue to its original, the symbol misrepresent the fact, it shall not be accepted, it shall not be imputed, it shall be an abomination, for it is not the Christ of God. St. Paul uses similar vehemence of language about Him Whom we call Christ. If He saw corruption and was not raised from the dead upon the third day, our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins.²

In this vehement language of the law there lies a deep pathos. It shows us the Father as it were solicitous for the honour of His Son. We shall meet with the same display of anxiety, if we may use human language of God's actions, in the directions to treat the flesh of the Sin-offering as of the utmost sanctity, lest men should think that He Who "became sin" had sin. So here the urgent reiteration of warning against the man who presumed to neglect the rule of no corruption, or to think that an animal dead upon the third day after its sacrifice could at all be a sacrifice of peace-offerings. It is made as like as it can be to Him whose sacred Body saw no corruption, but hanging lifeless on the tree still poured from its side the blood and water; which was not cast into the graves of the common people, but was reverently swathed in linen clothes with fragrant spices, and so laid in a new and rock-hewn tomb; which, finally, upon the third day very early in the morning, no earlier and no later, rose again from the tomb, alive for evermore. Known unto God are all His works from the foundation of the world, and amidst all the necessary limitations of symbolic forms, Divine Wisdom and Divine Solitude found

¹ Ps. xvi. 10.

² 1 Cor. xv. 17.

out a way to make the Sacrifice of Peace-Offerings like Him Who died and rose from the dead upon the third day.

We have now passed in review the regulations which governed the feast on the sacrifice of peace-offerings, and we have found that they required from the Israelite worshipper a special separation from ceremonial uncleanness, and that in all the arrangements for the accompaniment of the feast and for the treatment of the flesh of the sacrifice, care has evidently been taken to preserve their likeness to the Incarnate Son of God. In a former section of this chapter we have shown that the Blood and the Fat of the victim are called the Bread of God, because of the fulfilment of the Divine ideal of humanity by that Person of whose life and death they are a picture. Now we have seen that the same Person Who is the Bread of God is also the bread of His people. It is evident then that a true fellowship with God is established for men by means of this unique Person. The Altar has become a *Table of Jehovah*,¹ where men enjoy fellowship with Him. We believe that this is the central idea of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. There seems indeed to be a tripartite division of the animal, all the fat being the portion of Jehovah, the breast and the thigh being given to the priest, and the remainder being eaten by the worshippers. The inclusion of the priests in the fellowship which is established cannot, we think, be without significance. It is quite true that the priests received a part of each sacrifice as their due, on the principle that *those who minister about sacred things eat of the things of the temple, and they that wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar*;² and in Deuteronomy *the priest's due* from a sacrifice of peace-offerings is said to be *the shoulder and the two cheeks and the maw*.³ The word here translated "shoulder" is usually translated "arm," and occurs in connection with sacrifices elsewhere only in the book of Numbers, where it is expressly distinguished from the wave-breast and heave-thigh.⁴ These two portions of the sacrifice of peace-offerings must not then be considered as the priest's due. The right thigh, which is always called *the heave-thigh*, was no doubt heaved by the officiating priest, together with one out of each of the three kinds of cake, and became his portion of the sacrificial feast.⁵ We remember that at the time of the consecration of Aaron these things were all burnt upon the altar with the fat as a sweet savour before Jehovah.⁶ This was owing to the fact that on that

¹ Mal. i. 7.

⁴ Num. vi. 19, 20.

² 1 Cor. ix. 13.

⁵ Cf. Lev. vii. 14, 32, 33.

³ Deut. xviii. 3.

⁶ Exod. xxix. 25.

occasion Moses who officiated was not in the position of an individual officiating priest, and the inclusion of these offerings together with the fat in the Lord's portion at that time confirms the interpretation which we have given above of the officiating priest usually taking these offerings to himself. We said that his doing so showed that God received what was presented as a heave-offering for use in the symbolic service. This might of course have been shown equally well by the burning of the specimen offerings upon the altar, but it would have left the officiating priest out of the picture of fellowship. As the individual priest was there, and as the share of the mediating priesthood in the fellowship established was, as we shall see immediately, an important part of the truth to be illustrated, the acceptance of the gifts by him was obviously the best way of preserving the whole significance of the service. This accordingly was the law. The officiating priest took specimens of the cakes, and the right thigh, after heaving them before Jehovah, in token that Jehovah received the whole for His use, and also in illustration of the fact that the mediating priesthood were partners in the fellowship which had been established. This latter was indeed a fact of special significance. In the ritual at the consecration of Aaron, Moses was the sole representative of the priesthood. He represented in himself the old idea of leadership in the service of God, and also by his observance of the divinely appointed ritual he became the first exponent of the new idea of mediatorship. To him then was assigned a share in fellowship established by his ministry between God and Aaron's family. His *portion* was the wave-breast of Aaron's ram of consecration.¹ And this, which is an essential part of the similitude, became the perpetual rule for sacrifices of peace-offerings. The wave-breast became the portion of Aaron and his sons,² that is of the whole body of priests. The ritual connected with this wave-offering is peculiarly emphasized. *He that offereth the sacrifice of his peace-offerings unto Jehovah shall bring his oblation unto Jehovah, out of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings. His own hands shall bring the offerings of Jehovah made by fire; the fat with the breast shall he bring, that the breast may be waved for a wave-offering before Jehovah. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar, but the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons'.³* It is clear that in the Divine idea the share of the priests by reason of their anointing in all in which Jehovah and His people shared was intended to be

¹ Exod. xxix. 26.² Lev. vii. 31.³ *Ib.* 29-31.

emphasized.¹ The medium by which that fellowship was established, and through which it was enjoyed, was the victim: but then the victim was not a passive medium, as if having accomplished the work both towards God and towards man, its work was finished, and its own share at an end. The priesthood is called in to complete the picture, and render it truthful to the realities. Let us leave the uniting *cause* out of sight for a moment and fix our attention on the *result*; and we see Jehovah, His Priest, and His people seated, as it were, at the same table. The picture upon Mount Sinai, where the elders of Israel beheld God and did eat and drink, is made still clearer, and lo, there is Another with them, and His form is like the Son of God. We feel that here again the whole is adapted to be a true illustration of the fact that *our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.*²

But although we have for a moment withdrawn our eyes from the cause of this blessed union and fellowship, we cannot do so long; nor are we intended to do so. He Who has admitted us to fellowship with His Father and with Himself has shown that as regards His Father the moving cause is His own work of reconciliation and of acceptance. As regards ourselves He shows that the fellowship is to be enjoyed by union with Himself, symbolized by an act of feeding.

V This truth had not been without its adumbrations in the past, such as the fruit of the tree of life of which man ate and lived for ever, and the flesh of the Passover Lamb in the strength of which meat the children of Israel set out on their pilgrim journey; or the bread and the water which Jehovah supplied to them in the wilderness. In all these things Jehovah showed Himself to be united with His people as food and drink become united with our bodies. There can be little doubt that the Tree of Life for men has always been the Son of God; it is certain that the Lamb and the Manna and the Water are Christ: and in all these figures there lies hid the truth of an organic union between Himself and those to whom He becomes the source of life. Here in the sacrifice of peace-offerings the truth begins to take clearer shape. In a great prophecy,³ which we must consider separately in an additional note, the blessings offered by Messiah to all the world are symbolized as an invitation to partake of His sacrifice of peace-offerings. But it was reserved for the time when the Incarnate Son of God Himself stood upon the earth to declare openly that that life of men which in its essence is fellowship with God is to be obtained by eating

¹ Lev. vii. 35, 36.² 1 John i. 3.³ Ps. xxii. Appendix C.

His Flesh and drinking His Blood.¹ It was He Who, taking His materials from the passover feast, instituted for all time until He comes again the sacrament of eating and drinking as the sacrament of *Christ in us the hope of glory*.²

When we consider the Holy Communion of the Christian Church to be the true counterpart and continuation of the feast on the sacrifice of peace-offerings, we understand why the elements of our feast are taken from the bread and wine which lay upon the table there, and not from the sacrificial flesh. While the true sacrifice for sins was still in the future, it was important that it should be enacted and re-enacted by the death of sacrificial victims; but when it had once taken place, the continuation of animal death would be a kind of anticlimax. Our Lord Jesus therefore passed by the sacrificial flesh, and took the bread and broke it, and the wine and gave it to His disciples, saying, This is My Body and This is My Blood, eat and drink *this* in remembrance of Me. The ritual which looked forward to the giving of His Body and the shedding of His Blood was rightly to be distinguished from that which looked back upon it in continual remembrance. But it was also right that there should be a connecting link between the two. This link we find in the bread and wine of the sacrificial feast, which was not merely the necessary adjunct of a sacrificial meal, but was made as like as possible to the flesh of the sacrifice with which it was associated, in preparation, as we believe, for the time when it was to be adopted as the basis of the rite of the Holy Communion.

But the question has been asked, If the Holy Communion is really the Christian feast on the sacrifice of peace-offerings, why is it that we drink the Blood, which in the old ritual was so expressly assigned as the portion of God Himself, and forbidden at all times to the Israelites? Is there not here a contrast rather than a likeness between the law and that which we have supposed it to represent? This question we shall endeavour to answer, and so close our study of the sacrifice of peace-offerings.

We have noticed once and again that probably from the date of the expulsion from Eden, and certainly from the time of Noah, God had drawn the attention of men to a mystery of blood-shedding. At the time of the redemption from Egypt, and in all the Mosaic legislation, this mystery took a still more prominent position. On account of this the eating of blood was strictly forbidden to the Israelite; the partaking of the flesh of

¹ John vi.

² Col. i. 27.

any animal which had died of itself, or been torn by beasts, so that its blood had not been previously drained off, rendered the man unclean; and the shedding of blood in war had the same defiling effect.¹ All this was on account of the fact that in the tent of meeting blood was continually being shed as the penalty for sin, and to procure atonement for men. Blood stood in the Mosaic code and symbolism for death, and death took place for sin;² therefore the children of Israel were required to abstain from blood, and contact with it caused defilement. But if this was the case with the people away from the tent of meeting, the actual reverse was the case within the tent of meeting. There, on the contrary, everything was cleansed by contact with the blood of atonement. This phenomenon also had been exhibited before. Put on the lintel and doorposts of the Israelites in Egypt, blood purged them from their sins, so that the destroyer passed over them. Below Mount Sinai the blood of the covenant sprinkled on their persons brought them into fellowship with God, so that they went up and saw the God of Israel and ate and drank in His presence. It was no new thing then that in the tent of meeting every part of it was blood-sprinkled, or that priest was consecrated and leper was cleansed by the contact of blood. In the appointed place we find blood in the closest and most healthful contact with men. Its contrary effect elsewhere was solely connected with the maintenance of the symbolic prophecy, and a witness to the fact that sin is defiling, and death is the wage of sin; while in the tent of meeting the happy corollary is asserted, that an atoning Death has taken place; and that this Death applied to men cleanses them from all their sins. This we take to be preparatory to the language of the New Testament where we are called to eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man. Under the preparatory system the symbolic blood could only be applied externally, but it was a symbol of that which would not confer a ceremonial purity alone, but be an inward and soul-reforming power. In the words of the New Testament it would *cleanse the conscience from dead works to serve the living God*.³ Not by way of contravention then, but by way of fulfilment, when our Lord was about to give His own Flesh for the life of the world, He spoke of men drinking His Blood.

The words were an intimation that the pictures and consequent restrictions of the Mosaic Law were about to pass away; and may be compared with His predictions that the

¹ Lev. xvii. 10-16; Num. xxxi. 19. ² Cf. Num. xix. ³ Heb. ix. 13, 14.

worship of the central sanctuary would cease,¹ and that the ceremonial distinctions between things clean and unclean would be abolished.² But these things would not be so changed as to be destroyed. They would be carried to their fulfilment. In the present case He would give His own Flesh for the life of the world, and the effects of this life-surrender would enter into the inward parts of men like water.³ His Blood would not be sprinkled for ceremonial cleansing, it would be received within the man. This we believe to be the force of the declaration of our Lord in the synagogue at Capernaum. It does not appear that the figure of drinking His Blood shocked or stumbled His hearers. Just possibly they may have recalled the words of the Song of Moses, where he says that Jehovah fed His people with fat of lambs and the fat of kidneys of wheat, and with wine of the blood of the grape.⁴ Here in the figurative language of the poet both fat and blood are spoken of as the food and drink of the people even by Moses. May there not then have been some special figurative sense in which the strange Speaker told of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood? But the difficulty was that this man whom they all supposed to be the son of Joseph and Mary professed to have come down from heaven, and proposed to give Himself in some way to be their sustenance.⁵ It was a hard saying, and they could not receive it. But Peter detected in it sounds of eternal life, and waited on to see "the end of the Lord". He saw this on the night in which his Lord was betrayed, when He took bread and brake it and gave it to them saying, Take eat, this is My Body; likewise also the cup after supper saying, This cup is the new Covenant in My Blood, drink ye all of it. If this Body was broken and this Blood was shed, all was then fulfilled in the kingdom of God; and from that moment the sacrifices in the Temple were near to vanishing away, and the prohibitions of the law needless and out of date. Henceforward we take both Bread and Wine into our bodies as a pledge of the application of the one sacrifice to the inmost recesses of our being; and we give thanks to Him who did not leave us to recollect from afar, or even to receive upon our persons, but rather bade us drink in the memorials of His precious Blood; and who said in plainest language, and without proverb, *He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood abideth in Me and I in Him.*⁶

¹ John iv. 20.⁴ Deut. xxxii. 14.² Mark vii. 19.⁵ John vi. 41, 52, 60.³ Ps. cix. 18.⁶ *Ib.* 56.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SIN-OFFERING OR ATONEMENT.

THE chief authorities for the ritual of the sin-offering are as follows:—

Lev. IV-V. 13: a single oracle addressed to the children of Israel.

Lev. VI. 24-30: addressed to Aaron and his sons.

Num. XV. 22-36: addressed to the children of Israel in view of their entry into Canaan.

And, in addition to these, the ritual for the Day of Atonement, recorded in Lev. XVI. and XXIII. 26-32.

THE NAME.

The Hebrew word for sin-offering is *Chattath*. This word is first found in Genesis IV. 7, where Jehovah says to Cain, "If thou doest not well, *sin* lieth at the door"; and again in XVIII. 20, where He speaks of the *sin* of Sodom and Gomorrah as very grievous. Jacob says to Laban, "What is my *sin* that thou hast hotly pursued after me" (XXXI. 36); and Joseph's brethren declare that their father charged him to forgive their *sin* (L. 17). Pharaoh too speaks of his *sin* (Exod. X. 17). The verb *Chatha*, from which the noun is derived, occurs also not infrequently, and always in the same sense of sinning against God or against men (Gen. XX. 6, 9; XXXI. 39; XXXIX. 9; XL. 1; XLII. 22; XLIII. 9; XLIV. 32; Exod. V. 16; IX. 27, 34; X. 16; XX. 20; XXIII. 33), and cognate nouns are used in Genesis XIII. 13; XX. 9. It is clear then that the meaning of the word *Chattath* is simply *sin*, and it is this word for which, with very few exceptions, *sin* stands in the English version throughout the Old Testament. This name was given by God Himself to a peculiar form of offering which He commanded to be celebrated at the consecration of Aaron. It will be remembered that three animals were prepared

for sacrifice on that occasion. The first of these was a bullock, the blood of which was to be used in a special manner, and its carcass to be disposed of in a different way from any hitherto known in sacrificial use. To this offering God gave the name of *Chattath* or *Sin* (Exod. XXIX. 14), and the bullock is described as *the bullock of sin for atonement* (verse 36). At the same time also He announced His intention of ordaining a similar sin-offering to be celebrated annually (XXX. 10). But when the tabernacle was completed it was made clear that the *Chattath* of the day of consecration was intended to become the model of a permanent institution. Just as the ritual for the other two sacrifices of that day became the model for the burnt-offerings and the peace-offerings of the tabernacle, so this became the pattern of a new variety of offering, to be known henceforward as *sin* or *sin-offerings*. The Septuagint translators generally render *Chatha* by ἁμαρτάνω and *Chattath* by ἁμαρτία; but when the latter denotes a sin-offering it is commonly rendered περὶ ἁμαρτίας. The phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας as denoting sin-offerings may be seen in the quotation of Hebrews x. 6 (cf. XIII. 11), and in the words of St. Paul in Romans VIII. 3, where he speaks of God sending His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and *as a sin offering*. In the New Testament we find also the fuller phrases προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας (Heb. x. 18), θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν (Heb. x. 26), ἱλασμός περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (1 John II. 2). St. Peter says in effect that Christ died as a sin-offering (περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἀπέθανεν, 1 Pet. III. 18).

We have seen in our investigation of the term sin-offering that the rite was unknown before the time of the exodus, and was in fact an addition to the existing forms of animal sacrifice. The manner of its introduction in the Book of Leviticus is in exact accordance with this view. In the first place we notice that the existing forms of worship, such as the burnt-offering and the meal-offering, together with the sacrificial feast, form the subject of the first and of a single oracle; while the law of the sin-offering is introduced afterwards and with a repetition of the words, *Jehovah spake unto Moses*. We notice further that the phraseology by which the subject is introduced is significantly altered. In the case of each of the three preceding offerings it is said, *When any man offereth an oblation he shall offer it on this wise*, as if the object in hand was the regulation of existing practices. In the present case, on the contrary, we find the law introduced in the following manner,

If any one shall sin then let him offer, or then shall he offer such and such for a sin-offering, intimating that the offering of a sin-offering was a new requirement. We shall see later that the sin-offering was not the only addition to the forms of animal sacrifice which took place at this time, but that a trespass-offering was also added, allied in many respects to the sin-offering, but yet distinguished from it, not only in name, but also in ritual, and forming the subject of two separate oracles.¹ We find then, as we have already remarked in a preceding chapter, that the two existing forms of animal sacrifice were increased first to three, and then to four, and that the two additions made to them bore the names of Sin and of Trespass or Guilt. Of this latter word we shall speak more particularly in a later chapter; we now remark only that the additions made by God to the rites of animal sacrifice at this time are both concerned with the doctrine of sin. The time had come in the progress of Divine revelation to throw a strong light upon the nature and the effects of sin. The Holiness of their God had been impressed on the Israelites by the fires and by the Voice on Sinai. That holiness had been vindicated during those forty days when by their disobedience they forfeited the promise of His Presence. It was to be further impressed upon them by the statutes of His righteous law, and by all the ordinances of the tent of meeting. St. Paul has taught us that the intervention of God in the law given through Moses was *because of transgressions*,² to expand and also to deepen *the knowledge of sin*,³ so that *the trespass might abound*,⁴ in the sense, that is, of making more apparent the seriousness of its nature and effects. Here then was the time and the place for a development of the primitive testimony of sacrificial worship, in its witness to the consequences of sin. The custom of approach to God by animal sacrifice was primitive and universal. It was time to develop that element of its witness which is specially concerned with the fact of sin. This was done first by a variation of ritual which emphasized the death of the victim, so that the fatal character of sin to man was brought into prominence. But the introduction of a special form of sacrifice to emphasize the fatal consequences of sin was not only a witness to the sentence of the law that the soul that sinneth it shall die; it was much more a pledge that *as sin reigned in death so most surely does grace reign unto eternal life*. The sin-offering

¹ Lev. v. 14; vi. 1.² Gal. iii. 19.³ Rom. iii. 20.⁴ *Ib.* v. 20.

spoke indeed in the same accents as the law, and was part of the Divine plan to increase the knowledge of sin; but much more was it a Gospel message of atonement and forgiveness, all the more valued and necessary as the sin was the more felt to abound. This we believe to have been the reason for the institution of an offering for sin just at this time.

The law of sin-offerings applies *if any one shall sin unwittingly, in any of the things which Jehovah hath commanded not to be done, and shall do any one of them*. By these words the Israelite is assumed to be subject to the law of God. In the ten words spoken from Mount Sinai, and in the laws of the Book of the Covenant, he had been made aware of the things which Jehovah had commanded not to be done. The doing of any one of these things contradicted the very law of his existence, and rendered him liable to death. This is indeed a striking illustration of the nature and effects of sin. According to the ancient Scriptural record men are part of God's creative work, and by their very nature subject to His every prohibition. By disobedience to the solitary prohibition which He laid upon them sin entered into the world, and death by sin. Their act of disobedience invaded the rights of the Creator, and disturbed the moral relations between Him and His Creation, and contradicted the law of their existence. If a man shall do *any one* of the things which God has commanded not to be done he is guilty of death, says the law of sin-offerings. *Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, says the New Testament prophet, he is become guilty of all*. And he gives the reason for his statement, which is this, *For He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art become a transgressor of the law*.¹ It is a solemn consideration that we who exist by a creative act of God are transgressors of the law of that creation, whether in many points or only in one is so far immaterial; the fact is that by any disobedience we have introduced into His universe an infringement of law. If we have any conception of the Reign of Law in the material universe which God has created, and extend this conception to that moral and spiritual universe of which also we know ourselves to be a part, we shall find no difficulty in realizing that the doing of one thing which God has commanded not to be done may imperil our existence.

¹ James II. 10, 11.

Whether it be by much or by little the mark is missed,¹ and the inevitable consequence will follow. The marvel is not that God takes strict account of one act of disobedience, but that He finds means by which a creature which has violated the law of its existence may still live on.

It is important to examine the meaning of the word *unwittingly* in connection with the law of sin-offerings. It is the same word which is used for unpremeditated murder.² It is connected etymologically with the verb translated "err" in a part of this law,³ which accounts for the alternative marginal rendering "through error". The kind of error which is in view is that of being led astray, as for example by wine, or the passions, or through blindness, or by deception, or by sheer simpleness like the wandering of sheep.⁴ In the Book of Numbers sins of error are put in contrast with sins committed "with a high hand".⁵ On the whole, then, we conclude that the law of sin-offerings applies to cases of falling into sin as opposed to deliberate and calculated disobedience.

We can well understand that the provision of sin-offerings for unwitting sins only, and the unrelieved denunciation of the sentence of death against sins committed with a high hand, must have had an immediate effect upon the Israelite conscience. He was not allowed to imagine for a moment that he could wilfully disobey the Divine commands, and afterwards arrange the matter by an offering to Jehovah. The practical effect of the law of the sin-offering would be to intensify the sense of guilt incurred by every act of disobedience, and by no means to weaken the testimony of conscience. The law of Jehovah was recognized by the spiritual man as a force making for righteousness.⁶ We can imagine that this very law of the sin-offerings was in the heart of David when he wrote, *By the ordinances of Jehovah is Thy servant warned. . . . Who can discern his errors? Clear Thou me from hidden faults. Keep back Thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be clear from great transgression.*⁷ And we can see in what school he learned that his deliberate sins of adultery and murder were not those which admitted a sacrifice of propitiation.⁸ But while this was so to the spiritual man, the wilful sinner, but

¹ This is the original meaning of the verb *chatha*, and may be seen in Judges xx. 16.

² Num. xxxv. 11.

³ Lev. iv. 13.

⁴ Prov. xxviii. 10; Is. xxviii. 7; Prov. 5, 20; Deut. xxvii. 18; Job xii. 16; Ezek. xxxiv. 6.

⁵ Num. xv. 30.

⁶ Ps. xix. 7-9.

⁷ 1b. ii-13.

⁸ 1b. li. 16, 17.

formal Israelite, would still bring his offering to the priest and say that his wrongdoing was an error,¹ showing once more, not imperfection in the Divine ordinances, but that *to the pure all things are pure; while to them that are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; but both their mind and their conscience are defiled.*²

It has often been remarked that although sin-offerings are directed in the case of sins through error, and formed part of the prescribed ritual on many ceremonial occasions, direct mention of the sin-offering outside the Books of Moses is rare. David speaks of it in one of his Psalms;³ it is probably referred to by the prophet Hosea;⁴ it finds frequent mention in the great vision of Ezekiel;⁵ the name is found twice in the Book of Ezra,⁶ once in the book of Nehemiah,⁷ and once also in the Book of Chronicles.⁸ But compared with the frequent mention of burnt-offerings and sacrifices we are struck by the few allusions to the sin-offering. Several circumstances may be supposed to have contributed to this result. In the first place the occasions for particular mention of this offering are few. The reformation of Hezekiah is one such occasion, and there the priestly chronicler found mention of it in his authorities, and has preserved the record for us, while the compiler of the Book of Kings has been content to say that Hezekiah *kept the commandments which Jehovah commanded Moses.*⁹ But it is quite possible that apart from the stated occasions for such offerings the actual practice of this law was limited. Where the individual conscience was tender there would be hesitation in pleading that the lapse was through error: and with a general decay of spirituality there would be a corresponding decline in the sense of sin, a growing neglect of the law of the sin-offering. The history of Israel after the giving of this law was first a long period of wandering in the deserts, when religious ordinances were largely in abeyance, followed by a time of political confusion during the conquest of Canaan. After the death of Joshua and all that generation there followed a period of widespread apostacy, and consequently of great laxity in the observance of the Mosaic Law. It is not surprising then that a Law which was entirely new at the time of the establishment of the tabernacle service, and which was one of the most spiritual of its enactments, should be but little observed. Here again we are reminded that these laws for

¹ Eccles. v. 6.² Tit. i. 15.³ Ps. xl. 6.⁴ Hos. iv. 8, 9.⁵ Ezek. xl.-xlvi.⁶ Ezra vi. 17; viii. 35.⁷ Neh. x. 33.⁸ 2 Chron. xxix. 21; Cf. also Jer. xi. 15 (LXX).⁹ 2 Kings xviii. 6.

sacrificial worship have an ideal character, and a purpose beyond that of immediate observance, beyond even that of their moral effect upon the chosen people. We feel that they are purposely made like the great and permanent realities of sin and of salvation, with a view to future revelations of the open Gospel.

The fact then that sin-offerings were prescribed even for sins of error we believe to correspond to the truth about sin. Sin, whether deliberate or unintentional, is equally a violation of law; or as St. John phrases it, *Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness, and sin is lawlessness.*¹ If all sin is violation of law, even the sin through error involves the sinner in the full penalty of sin, he is guilty of all, as St. James has said.

And once again the fact that sin-offerings were prescribed *only* for sins of error is also in complete accordance with the truths of salvation. It is assumed that the Israelite will not deliberately transgress the commandments of God, because no other assumption would be true to the principle of regenerate life. For the high-handed Israelite sinner there is one comprehensive rule, *That soul shall be utterly cut off: his iniquity shall be upon him;*² in complete agreement with the principle that *Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin . . . and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God.*³ But for sins of error a sin-offering of atonement is provided, *for in many things we all stumble,*⁴ and *if we say that we have not sinned we make Him a liar and His word is not in us.*⁵ The message of the law of sin-offerings is framed to correspond exactly with the message which the Apostles were to hear from God, and which has now been announced by them to us. *God is light and in Him is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him and walk in the darkness, we lie and do not the truth. But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin.*⁶

We believe, then, that the ritual of the law of sin-offerings is made like the truth that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin those who walk by the law of God's commandments. It is silent upon the larger question of the forgiveness of wilful sins, and the taking away of the sin of the world. But the Law of Moses is not silent on these points. In the ritual for the great Day of Atonement, which we must consider in a following chapter, we shall see that a Bloodshedding

¹ 1 John III. 4.

² Num. xv. 31.

³ 1 John III. 9.

⁴ James III. 2.

⁵ 1 John I. 10.

⁶ Ib. 5-7.

of Atonement would take place not only for their sins of error, but for *all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins*; and we shall see also that it is an identical sacrifice and bloodshedding which atones both for those and for these.

We now come to study the law of sin-offerings itself, which falls into two sections, each containing a complete series of sin-offerings. These two series will be considered separately.

FIRST SERIES.

The first series, which is contained in chapter IV., brings before us four cases in which a sin-offering is to be presented. The first is when the anointed priest should sin so as to bring guilt upon the people. This refers to an error committed by the high priest. We have already remarked that the high priest by bearing the names of the people on his shoulders and within his breastplate was marked as the representative of the people before Jehovah. If then in the discharge of his high priestly functions he committed an error, it necessarily involved the people for whom he was acting in guilt. The second case is when the whole congregation errs, and in this case the assembly collectively are to bring a sin-offering, and the elders are to represent them in the service. The third case is that of sin by an individual ruler, and the fourth case that of sin by one of the common people. In the first two cases the offerings prescribed are identical, namely a young bullock. A ruler was to bring a male goat, and one of the common people a female goat or lamb. The value of the offering is then graded according to the position of the offerer. In the first two cases, though the offering itself is identical, there is also a slight indication that the position of the high priest is superior to that of the congregation, for the bullock of the high priest was slain *at the door of the tent of meeting*, while that for the people was slain *before the tent of meeting*. But we have already noticed that the greater sacrifices were slain at the entrance of the court, so that the high priest in his official capacity occupies the most exalted position; next comes the whole congregation, then the individual rulers, and finally a member of the common people. We believe that this minute variation of ritual in the case of the high priest bears reference to the fact that in this system he is not the representative of the people in the sense in which their elders act for them. He does represent them and act for them indeed, but in such a way as to be like Him who being originally

in the form of God, and continuing in that very form, took also upon Him our nature, so that He might stand in our place and bear our responsibilities.

We shall confine ourselves now to the chief offering of this series, the sin-offering of the high priest, but with the constant recollection that even this is not the highest type of sin-offering which we know, nor does it give a complete picture of atonement. That must be sought in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, which will be our subject in the next chapter.

It has been remarked¹ that "sin is not usually regarded in the Old Testament as a condition (i.e. sinfulness), but as a definite act of thought, word, or deed. The word was applied not only to moral evil and idolatry, but also to breaches of ceremonial regulations". This double reference and some specific act are probably in view in the present case. *If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people, then let him offer for his sin which he hath sinned a young bullock without blemish unto Jehovah for a sin-offering.* Some specific error of the high priest acting in his official capacity is in view. If it was a breach of ceremonial regulations, it was a violation of the Divine order under which the high priest was appointed to exercise his functions; if it was a breach in his official conduct of the moral law, it was a violation of the eternal code of right and wrong, to which every man is by his very nature and constitution amenable. In either case sin had entered in, and death by sin; then *let him offer a sin-offering for his sin which he hath sinned.* It cannot, we think, be without significance that in all other cases the command is expressed in a more positive manner, *he shall offer a sin-offering*; while in the case of the anointed priest it takes a less decisive form, *let him offer.* We do not press the point, but it may be connected with the unique position of the high priest in the whole system. In the strictest sense he and he alone was the appointed mediator between God and the Israelites. If the inferior priests acted as mediators they did so simply as a concession to practical necessities; the office and the work belonged strictly to the anointed priest alone. But the anointed priest of the symbolic picture was but a mortal man, and prone to err. If he himself needed the intervention of a mediator, what was to be done? In this case, said the Divine oracle, *let him offer for his sin which he hath sinned a young bullock without blemish unto Jehovah for a sin-offering.* The error of the anointed priest

¹ In "O.T. Synonyms" under Sin.

marred his likeness to the true Mediator ; and there was need for a symbolic removal of his guilt.

We have noticed in the series of sin-offerings that in two cases the animal prescribed is a *young bullock*, or in a more literal rendering, *a steer, the son of a bull*. This animal formed the sin-offering at the consecration of Aaron,¹ and at the purification of the Levites.² It was also prescribed as the sin-offering for the priests on the Day of Atonement.³ It occurs also twice in the vision of Ezekiel as a sin-offering for the priest and for the sanctuary.⁴ The use of an animal of this description in sacrifice was not, however, confined to the sin-offering. We find it prescribed also for a burnt-offering,⁵ with the law of which it evidently corresponded. In two other cases of this series of sin-offerings goats are appointed, although in the last of the series the alternative of a lamb is allowed. It is worthy of notice that the goat is specially associated with sin-offerings, as at the inauguration of the tabernacle service,⁶ on the Day of Atonement,⁷ and in the series of offerings appointed for festal occasions.⁸ Twelve he-goats were offered as a sin-offering for all Israel on two occasions after the return from the Babylonian captivity.⁹ It is not impossible that the association of the worship of the he-goat with gross forms of idolatry,¹⁰ and its special connection with the sin-offering, may have combined to influence Jewish feeling with regard to the animal, and indirectly occasioned the placing of the goats on the left hand and the sheep on the right hand in our Lord's parable of the judgment. We must not think, however, that any idea of evil attached to the goat originally, for we find it amongst the sacrificial victims prescribed to Abraham, and it is one of the alternative forms for burnt-offerings and sacrifices of peace-offerings. Here also it is not the only, nor is it the leading form of sin-offering. But it is not impossible that the position it held in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, and in the offerings at the feasts, caused it to be connected in a special way with sin in the minds of the Jewish people. Here, however, the sin-offering, whether young bullock or goat or lamb, must be *without blemish*, for it is to be made like the spotless Lamb of God.

¹ Exod. xxix. 1, and cf. Lev. ix. 2.

² Num. viii. 8.

³ Lev. xvi. 3, 6.

⁴ Ezek. xliii. 19 ; xlv. 18.

⁵ Lev. xxiii. 18 ; Num. vii. 15 ; viii. 8 ; xv. 24 ; xxviii. 11 ; xxix. 2 ; and so in Ezek. xliii. 23 ; xlv. 6.

⁶ Lev. ix. 3.

⁷ *Ib.* xvi. 5.

⁸ *Ib.* xxiii. 19 ; Num. vii. 16 ; xxviii. 15 ; xxix. 5 ; and so in Ezek. xliii. 22 ; xlv. 23.

⁹ Ezra vi. 17 ; viii. 35.

¹⁰ Lev. xvii. 7.

The ritual then proceeds in exact correspondence with the ritual for the burnt-offerings and the sacrifices of peace-offerings, showing, as we have often remarked before, that these three agree in one, and point to one Person and one Work.

He shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tent of meeting before Jehovah. Here, as before, is the picture of individual application by the appointed means.

And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the bullock ; transferring his responsibilities to it, and in this case especially the responsibility of the sin which he hath sinned.

And kill the bullock before Jehovah. This is the immediate result of bearing sin before Jehovah ; and upon this aspect of the work of the Substitute and Representative of men the ritual of this offering is about to lay the greatest stress.

And the anointed priest shall take of the blood of the bullock, and bring it to the tent of meeting ; and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before Jehovah, before the veil of the sanctuary. And the priest shall put of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before Jehovah, which is in the tent of meeting. To this elaborate ritual then the simple act of presentation of the blood in the ritual of the burnt-offering has expanded. In our study of the burnt-offering we found that the blood of the slain victim, present in the sacrificial bowl, was the emblem of its life-surrender. We also saw that its presentation was the bringing of it near, obviously in the sense of bringing it near before Jehovah, although the exact phrase did not in that connection occur. Here, however, we find both the idea and the actual words repeated with emphasis. The high priest having slain his sin-offering himself catches its blood, for in this case he has to perform the duties of priest as well as offerer. This may be the reason why we read first of *the anointed priest* and then of *the priest*. If the law had said "the priest shall take the blood of the bullock," it might have been doubted whether when the anointed priest had been guilty of error some other priest should not for the moment take his place in the office of mediation. But when the high priest himself was present this could not under any circumstances be allowed, without the appearance at least of modifying the truth of the mediator being one person and one alone. On the other hand, if the law had continued, "the anointed priest shall dip his finger in the blood," the conclusion might have been drawn that a man was making atonement for himself. Expressed as the Divine wisdom has expressed it, the double truth that the Mediator between God and men is

One Person, and only one, and that the sin of men is atoned for only by the intervention of a Mediator in their behalf, seems to be preserved.¹ The priest then, for we look at the high priest now as the embodiment of the mediatorial functions, takes the blood within the tent of meeting. Here he puts his finger in the bowl and sprinkles the blood seven times before Jehovah, standing before the veil as he does so. He also puts of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense before Jehovah. This constitutes the full rite of presentation, although upon the Day of Atonement the blood was brought actually within the veil, and to the immediate presence of the Divine Glory, by being sprinkled before the mercy-seat. In this series of sin-offerings, however, the bringing near of the blood before Jehovah went no further than the sprinkling before the veil, and the putting of blood upon the horns of the golden altar that always stood over against the mercy-seat. In the inferior sin-offerings there is a contracted ritual of presentation, but a ritual still peculiar to this form of offering. In these cases the priest was to place the blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering. There it lay present to the sight of Jehovah, and with the same significance as in the fuller forms of the rite. The life had been surrendered in response to the just claims of Jehovah, and the token of the life-surrender is, as it were, submitted to His gaze. This is, as we have already seen, in exact accordance with the revealed truth that the Death of our Substitute and Representative upon the cross was to satisfy the Divine Justice; so that God might Himself remain just, while He justified him who has faith in Jesus.²

And all the blood of the bullock shall he pour out at the base of the altar of burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tent of meeting. This act corresponds to the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar round about, which we have noticed as part of the ritual in both the burnt-offering and the sacrifice of peace-offerings. We have shown that it corresponds to the Gospel truth that the death of the Lord Jesus Christ lies, as it were, at the base of all His work on our behalf. The Incarnation of the Son of God alone could not avail to raise men to God, nor enable Him to dispense to them His favours. Both the golden mercy-seat therefore and the altar of burnt-offering must be dashed with blood if they are to present a true likeness of Him

¹ The same variation of phrase occurs in the law of a sin-offering for the whole congregation, where also it implies that the high priest was to be the officiant on such an occasion (Lev. iv. 16, 17).

² Rom. iii. 24-26.

concerning Whom the first message of the Gospel is that He died for our sins. This principal truth about the Christ it is the mission of the sin-offering to emphasize. In the special and elaborate rites of presentation we have seen how this death took place before Jehovah, to satisfy His just and holy law. In the rite we are considering now we see that it is necessary that Christ must suffer, if He is in any way to render an acceptable service to God for us. If Christ offers His own obedience on our behalf, He does it as One Who was dead and is alive again; for the Divine Justice cannot accept even that service without due satisfaction rendered for our sins. Each form of animal sacrifice displays the blood upon the altar; in the rites of the sin-offering it is in every case and with emphasis enjoined that *all the blood which is left over after the rites of presentation shall be poured out at the bottom of the altar.*¹

And all the fat of the bullock of the sin-offering he shall take off from it; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys, shall he take away, as it is taken off from the ox of the sacrifice of peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of burnt-offering. Here we come to a rite, the identity of which with the ritual of the sacrifice of peace-offerings is specially drawn attention to once and again.² When the sin-offering was offered for himself or for the whole congregation, the fat was removed by the high priest himself, and burnt by him upon the altar. When it was offered for an individual, the offerer himself removed the fat, and gave it to the priest to be *burnt upon the altar for a sweet savour to Jehovah, upon*³ *or after the manner of the fire-offerings of Jehovah.*⁴ This was according to the regular ritual for burnt-offerings, whether in the whole burnt-offering, or in the burning of the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. The ritual of the sin-offering keeps steadily in view the total consecration to God of the Representative and Substitute of men, and their need of individual reliance upon His work of righteousness no less than upon His work of atonement; or perhaps rather their need of entire reliance upon Him, to satisfy all the claims of God upon them.

With this act the sin-offering is completed; and the effect of it is noted in the words, four times repeated in the course of

¹ Lev, iv, 7, 18, 25, 30, 34.

² Ib, 10, 26, 31, 35.

³ Ib, 31.

⁴ Ib, 35.

this section, *And the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven.*¹ It is noticeable, however, that these words do not occur in the law of a sin-offering for the anointed priest, and the omission cannot, we think, be without significance. We have already remarked more than one detail of peculiarity in the sin-offering of the high priest, and we meet here with yet another variation from the general law of sin-offerings. We think that it may be accounted for in this case by a consideration of what were the alternatives to omitting the clause altogether. If the words had been inserted, they must have been either in the form, *And the anointed priest shall make atonement for himself, and he shall be forgiven*, or else, *And the priest shall make atonement for him, and he shall be forgiven*. In the latter case there would have been some unreality in the language, since the priest who was making the atonement was himself the person to be atoned for and no real mediation took place at all. In the former alternative a statement would have been made which is unlike the eternal truth that no man ever made atonement for himself. We do not forget that in the ritual of the Day of Atonement it is twice repeated that Aaron should *make atonement for himself and for his house*.² But we feel at once that the words "making atonement for himself and for his house"³ do not convey the same impression as would have been conveyed if it had been said that the high priest made atonement for himself for the sin which he had sinned. We know that no man ever has made, or can make, atonement for himself for the sin which he has sinned; and this is why the words are omitted here. Where atonement has been necessary and has been made, it has always been by the instrumentality of another. The exact phrase *the priest shall make atonement for him* is therefore an essential part of the ritual of that offering whose special mission is to bear witness to the truths of atonement; but if it cannot stand it is better to omit it altogether. This we believe to be the true account of the omission of these words in the law of sin-offering of a high priest.

The object and effect of the sin-offering is then *atonement and forgiveness of sin*. Atonement is effected by the life-surrender of the Substitute and Representative of men, for although the making of atonement by the priest is here mentioned

¹ Lev. iv. 20, 26, 31, 35.

² *Ib.* xvi. 6, 11.

³ Or "for himself and for the people" as in Lev. xvi. 24.

immediately after the offering of the fat as a sweet savour, it evidently refers directly not to that, but to the special ritual of the blood. The burnt-offering, we remember, was accepted for the offerer to make atonement for him,¹ but this was because it included in its ritual the blood-shedding of atonement. Its main reference was not to this aspect of the work of Christ, but rather to the acceptability of His service rendered to God on our behalf. The ritual of the burnt-offerings accordingly closes in each case upon the note of *a sweet savour unto Jehovah*.² In the sacrifice of peace-offerings again, although the blood of atonement is present, the thought of atonement recedes still further into the background, and the ritual of each offering closes upon the notes of acceptability and fellowship.³ But in the sin-offering, where the main emphasis of the ritual lies upon the use of the blood, whether in the rite of presentation or in its connection with the work of the altar, the effect is stated in each case to be that the priest has *made atonement*, for it is the blood that makes atonement by reason of the life of the surrender of which it is the token.⁴ It is unnecessary to labour this point still further; we have found it to be the consistent teaching of Holy Scripture that Christ died to make atonement. And this making of atonement is an objective process; it takes place before Jehovah, to reconcile Him to us; and it takes place through the life-surrender and the mediation of another. This is so in the reality, and it is so exactly in the true likeness of that reality. By this means, and by this means alone, the sins of men which they have sinned are covered.

And atonement results in forgiveness. The atonement makes a way, as it were, for the forgiveness. The picture surely is not that of an angry despot, whose wrath has to be propitiated by some signal example of vengeance. Rather do we see in the law of sin-offering a revelation of the nature and effect of sin, and of the exceeding grace of God. Sin is laid bare in its aspect of law-breaking and violation of Divine order. While man is invading the prerogatives, and opposing the decrees of his Creator, what can he expect but to be cut off from among His people? This is how sin in His creatures appears before the Almighty, and unless it can be covered so as to disappear from His view, it must surely involve the creatures in destruction. All this the law of the sin-offering makes plain. But it also throws light upon that exceeding

¹ Lev. i. 4.³ *Ib.* iii. 5, 11, 16, 17.² *Ib.* 9, 13, 17.⁴ Exod. xxx. 10; Lev. xvii. 11.

grace of God, which provides a Substitute and Representative for men, who by His dying does cover their sins, and sets free the loving favour of God towards them. The blood of bulls and goats could not do this, it could only bear witness to this. But the sin-offering with its solemn ritual of shed blood, and its assurances of forgiveness, showed to men the promise of the future, and revealed the character of God. It set its seal upon the name of Jehovah which declared Him to be a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in loving-kindness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands and forgiving iniquity and transgressions and sin. It set its seal also upon the announcement that He will by no means clear the guilty ;¹ and it showed, by a figure, how these apparently conflicting statements are reconciled.

It is blood-shedding then which opens the way for the free grace of God, and which makes possible the Father's welcome to the prodigal son. The Hebrew word used here for "forgiveness" (*salach*), is in the Old Testament appropriated to the pardon extended by God to sinners. And this is the message of the sin-offering, *He shall be forgiven*. The man after God's own heart saw in the moment of his deep contrition the true nature of what he had done; he had *sinned against Jehovah*, and was "a son of death".² To this true thought of his heart the prophetic message was directed, *Jehovah also hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die*. David then entered into the experience of forgiveness of which the law of the sin-offering speaks. St. Paul has told us that the forgiveness of David is an example of the forgiveness which is offered to all through the propitiation in the blood of Christ. The blessing of David is pronounced upon all who have faith in Jesus, *Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin*.³

In the cases of the three inferior offerings for sin the ritual closes with the assurance of forgiveness. But in the two chief offerings there is a further direction with regard to the disposal of the remainder of the victim. This direction cannot be without significance. It does not indeed form a part of the sin-offering itself, for then it must have applied to every form of sin-offering. But it is intended to bear some likeness to Him who gives Himself as the true sin-offering, otherwise it would scarcely have found a place in the ritual here. The law for the disposal of the victim is as follows :—

¹ Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.² 2 Sam. xii. 5, 13.³ Rom. iii. 25, 26; iv. 6-8.

The skin of the bullock, and all its flesh, with its head, and with its legs, and its inwards, and its dung, even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall it be burnt.

We remember that a similar direction had been given as regards the treatment of the sin-offering at the consecration of Aaron: *the flesh of the bullock, and its skin, and its dung, shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a sin-offering.*¹ The ritual for all chief sin-offerings then was to preserve this feature of the first sin-offering. We notice in the present direction, however, that the phrase *without the camp* is still further defined as *a clean place without the camp, and the place where the ashes are poured out*. The former command was given in view of the making of the tabernacle, but when the present law of offerings was given, the service of the tabernacle had already begun, although Aaron's consecration had not yet taken place. Apparently both Moses and Aaron exercised priestly functions at this time, and the daily burnt-offering was taking place upon the altar;² while the ashes from the altar were carried to some place outside the camp, and there poured out. To this place then the remainder of the victim of the sin-offering was to be conveyed, and there consumed by fire. The definite regulation as regards the disposal of the ashes from the altar of burnt-offering was given in a subsequent oracle,³ but the ashes must already have been disposed of in some way, and the phraseology of the words which we are considering makes it clear that they were taken without the camp. This practice may have been due to reverential instinct, which sought to remove from human contact what had been used in Divine service; or it may have been suggested by the Divine command to burn the sin-offering at Aaron's consecration without the camp. The important thing is that, however originated, the custom now received Divine sanction and authority, as regards both the ashes from the brazen altar and the flesh of the sin-offering.

It seems clear that the burning of the flesh with fire is for the purpose of protecting it from contamination, especially as it is stipulated that it must be burned in a clean place. The flesh of the sin-offering is indeed regarded as a *most holy* thing. In the cases where it was not burnt with fire without the camp, this principle is most strongly asserted, no doubt because in

¹ Exod. xxix. 14.² *Ib.* 38; xl. 29-32.³ Lev. vi. 10, 11.

these cases there was more risk of its violation. Whatever touched the flesh became holy; if any of the blood became sprinkled on a garment, the garment must be washed in a holy place, that is within the area of the tabernacle court, no doubt as a precaution against the holy blood being brought into contact with any defilement. If the flesh was boiled in an earthen vessel, to avoid desecration the vessel was to be broken after use; if in a brazen vessel, the vessel was to be scoured or rinsed with water. This most holy flesh was to be eaten by the priests alone within the tabernacle area.¹ In all these ways the extreme sanctity of the flesh of the sin-offering was emphasized. We recognize at once the type according to which this ritual was framed. It is the truth which St. Paul proclaimed, that God made Him to be sin on our behalf Who knew no sin;² and which St. John declared, *Ye know that He was manifested to take away sins, and in Him is no sin.*³ But the ritual suggests more than purity, it asserts sanctity in the flesh of the sin-offering; for the Body of the true Sin-offering is sacred as the temple itself;⁴ and, although given for our sins, it was shielded from contamination and guarded by angels. Very beautiful also is the likeness which is contained in the ordinance that whatever touches the flesh shall be holy, and whatever the blood is sprinkled upon shall also be holy. We are reminded of the Hand that was laid upon the leper for his cleansing, and of the trembling woman who touched the hem of the Garment, and was healed of her plague. So also by the spiritual contact of the Holy Communion "our sinful bodies are made clean by the Lord's Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood".

But if insistence upon the purity and sanctity of the victim alone were in view, it is not easy to see the necessity for the burning of the victim *without the camp*. Would it not be sufficient to provide for a clean place near by, where the ashes might be placed, and all that needed to be guarded from desecration burnt? But the taking of the body without the camp is evidently a point of importance, as it finds special mention in the original, as well as in two subsequent sin-offerings,⁵ and in the ritual for the Day of Atonement.⁶ The ordinance of the regular sin-offering seems to imply that it was the priest himself who carried the victim forth without the camp, while on the Day of Atonement it is simply directed that the sin-

¹ Lev. vi. 24-29.

² 1 John iii. 5.

⁵ Exod. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 12, 21.

³ 2 Cor. v. 21.

⁴ John ii. 19-21; Matt. xii. 6.

⁶ Lev. xvi. 27.

offerings *shall be carried forth*. We have most happily a New Testament commentary upon the meaning of this direction.¹ The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us that it was intended as a picture of the manner in which Jesus, the true Sin-offering, suffered expulsion from the camp of Israel, and died outside the city of Jerusalem.² We remember that the Lord Jesus mentioned as one important particular of His coming sufferings that He would be delivered by the Jews to the Gentiles. We recall how the prediction was fulfilled, when the chosen people rejected Him in their council and before the Roman governor, demanding that He should be crucified. And their voices prevailed. *They took Jesus therefore ; and He went out, bearing the cross for Himself, unto the place called the place of a skull, and the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city.*³ Whether then it was the priest himself, or other persons, who carried forth the flesh of the greater sin-offerings without the camp, there was in each case a true picture of that solemn procession to Calvary. There the condemned robber touched the Holy Flesh by faith, and became a saint of God and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven ; there too the Father's care found for the sacred offering a clean and hallowed resting-place ; there also it passed from its mortal condition by a glorious change on the third day. Not upon the altars nor within the temple court of Israel, but upon the altar of a cross, and in a clean place outside the Jewish capital, the great sin-offering was offered and passed from human sight. Was there a suspicion in any Israelite mind that the true Sin-offering would suffer without the camp as that sacred flesh was carried through the lines of tents before his eyes, or did he only see one more token of human defilement and of his own inherent sinfulness ?

It is a general rule of the sin-offerings that when the blood of the victim was taken within the holy place its body was burned without the camp, and when the blood was not taken within, its body was otherwise disposed of.⁴ The only recorded exception to this is the case of the sin-offering which was offered for Aaron on each of the seven days of his consecration.⁵ In this sin-offering the blood was not taken into the sanctuary, yet the body of the victim was burned

¹ Heb. XIII. 11, 12.

² In this way the direction to carry the body of the sin-offering without the camp was complied with in the Temple worship (Edersheim, "The Temple," p. 324).

³ John XIX. 17, 20,

⁴ Lev. VI. 30 ; Heb. XIII. 11,

⁵ Exod. XXIX. 10-14.

without the camp. We remember, however, that the directions for the ritual of consecration were given before the law of the sin-offerings had been promulgated, and that this is the first example of a special offering for sin. It emphasized the chief features of the future law of sin-offerings in (1) a special ritual of presentation of blood, (2) a special treatment of the flesh of the victim. But the ritual of presentation was not so fully developed, nor is the treatment of the flesh so fully emphasized,¹ as in the later law of sin-offerings. We have here evidently the preliminary study, as it were, of the later finished picture. The sin-offering for Aaron on the first day of his ministration for a special reason, which we shall discuss later, followed the ritual for his sin-offering on the days of consecration.² The services of this first day of ministration, indeed, were never repeated, but the service of consecration was repeated on every succession to the priesthood. We suggest that the blood of the high priest's sin-offering was not taken into the holy place on these occasions so that the whole service might proceed under the eyes of the people, and also perhaps because on subsequent occasions of the consecration of a high priest there would be no Moses to act as priest, and the new high priest would have to act for himself.³ The reason for the flesh being nevertheless burned without the camp will be obvious when we have considered the only possible alternative, and this we now proceed to do.

We have now to consider the cases where the blood was put only upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering and not taken within the holy place. In these cases the law is as follows: *The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it; in a holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tent of meeting; and again, Every male among the priests shall eat thereof; it is most holy.*⁴ In this respect the law of sin-offerings was more strict than the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. Of the latter any person of the priest's family, male or female, might eat, if only they were ceremonially clean; and the flesh might be partaken of in a clean place in the home.⁵ But of the flesh of the sin-offerings the priests alone might partake, and the flesh must be eaten only in the court of the tabernacle. This distinction is expressed by calling the flesh of the sin-offering *most holy*, or, more literally, *holy of holies*. This phrase is applied to the tent of meeting and to all its furniture, together with the laver

¹ Comp. Exod. xxix. 14 with Lev. iv. 11, 12.

² Lev. ix. 8-11 would offer a precedent for this,

³ *Ib.* x. 14 and xxii. 1-16,

⁴ Ch. xvii. p. 309.

⁵ *Ib.* vi. 26, 29,

and the altar of burnt-offering. All these were anointed with the holy oil, and so sanctified as to be most holy, *whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy*.¹ The incense stored within the tabernacle and burnt upon the golden altar was also reckoned most holy.² Besides these every devoted thing, in the technical sense of the word devoted,³ and every meal-offering, including the shewbread, were in the same category.⁴ But of the animal sacrifices the sin- and trespass-offering alone were termed most holy;⁵ and of the former it is distinctly asserted that *whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy*.⁶ This was not the case with holy things,⁷ and a distinction between "holy" and "most holy" is not infrequently referred to in a marked manner.⁸ We are inclined to think that the tabernacle and its furniture, the incense, and the devoted things, were all called "most holy" on account of their being consecrated to the Divine service alone. The reason for the term being applied to the meal-offerings may be partly the same, as they were wholly surrendered to God no less than the things which have been mentioned. But we think that there was in this case an additional reason which will be mentioned when we come to our study of the meal-offerings. As regards the sin- and trespass-offerings, we believe that it was part of the Divine plan to emphasize the purity and the sanctity of the true Sin-offering. It may well be that the Divine message to the prophet Daniel is couched in the language of the law of sin-offering, and is indeed its true interpretation. *Seventy weeks, we read, are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy*.⁹ It is also deeply significant to notice that in the near context of this angelic message, there is express mention that Messiah shall be cut off, and the Jewish camp and polity come to an end, both of which are truths which are emphasized in the law of the sin-offering.

This most holy flesh then the priest who offers it for sin must consume. The atonement is effected by priest and victim acting in concert, the living man continuing the work from the point to which the animal has carried it before its death; and the whole service is closed by the priest consuming what remains of the victim, not as a sacrificial feast of

¹ Exod. xxx. 26-29.

⁴ Num. xviii. 9; Lev. xxiv. 9.

⁷ Hag. ii. 12,

² *Ib.* 36.

⁵ Num. xviii. 9.

⁸ E.g. Lev. xxi. 22,

³ Lev. xxvii. 28.

⁶ Lev. vi. 27.

⁹ Dan. ix. 24.

fellowship in his home, but as a strictly official duty within the tabernacle precinct. The act symbolizes the union of priest and victim in the work of atonement. We believe that Aaron had some real conception of the meaning of this symbolic act, when he refused to eat the flesh of the sin-offering on the day of the judgment on Nadab and Abihu. It was apparently the close of the first day on which Aaron and his sons performed sacrificial worship after their consecration. The sacrifices of the day were over; his own sin-offering had been offered and burnt; the sin-offering of the people had also been offered, and the flesh was reserved to be eaten by the priests. The whole ritual had been concluded, and the people had dispersed. Then came the rash and disobedient act of Nadab and Abihu, whatever it was, and their sudden death. Moses warns Aaron and his remaining sons not to touch the dead bodies, nor to show signs of grief, but to remain within the tabernacle enclosure. Jehovah Himself addresses a solemn warning to Aaron, and Moses institutes a diligent enquiry into all other ritual matters concerning the sacrifices of the day. In the course of this enquiry he misses the flesh of the sin-offering of the people, and enquires of Aaron why it had been burnt. It was a sin-offering for the people, and not for himself, and its blood had not been taken into the sanctuary; it should certainly have been eaten in the place of the sanctuary. He had by means of this victim borne the iniquity of the congregation, and made atonement for them before Jehovah; he should certainly have eaten it in the sanctuary as Moses commanded. Aaron replied in effect that a signal judgment had that day fallen upon the priesthood in the person of his sons; would it then have been well-pleasing to God if he had symbolically identified himself with that most holy victim? How could he, who lay at the moment under the judgment of God, still appear as the sin-bearer? No, he had burnt the victim, even as he had burnt the sin-offering for himself, for he felt himself to be the sinner, and not the anointed priest bearing iniquity and making atonement for sin. And when Moses heard that, it pleased him. Spiritual instinct showed Aaron the true intention of the rite, and Moses acknowledged his judgment to be correct.¹

This leads us to remark in closing our study of this section how entirely the sinner is excluded from the work of atonement for sin. In the sin- and trespass-offerings there is

¹ Lev. ix. x,

the fire-offering of the fat. But when the main emphasis of the offering lies upon atonement by blood-shedding, no meal-offering and drink-offering are admitted with its fire-offering. This omission in these two offerings, which are specially concerned with sin and trespass, seems to be connected with the fact that the work of atonement and satisfaction for sin is entirely independent of what we ourselves can do. This work we must let alone for ever. It is all done by Another; and therefore in these sacrifices for sin the whole work is confined to the priest and victim, with marked exclusion of the offerer. But, as we have seen, priest and victim have been made like the true Mediator and the true Sin-offering; and now finally the two are symbolically joined into one, because in the reality Mediator and Sin-offering are one and the same.

SECOND SERIES.

A second series of sin-offerings is found in chapter V. 1-13. It is quite true that the name "trespass-offering" is given to these in verses 6 and 7, but evidently not in its technical sense; for in verse 6 it is expressly said that the trespass-offering is to be *for a sin-offering*, and in verse 7 the trespass-offering consists of two birds, *one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering*. The last offering of the series is also expressly declared to be a sin-offering.¹ We conclude then that the alternative rendering in the margin, *for his guilt*, correctly paraphrases the meaning of the original. All sin-offerings are trespass-offerings in the sense of being offered for trespass; and although the word "trespass" is about to be appropriated to a new form of offering, it applies equally in the case of the sin-offering, and is used frequently in this connection in the present series. We remember that in the first series we have already met with the word in speaking of the anointed priest so sinning as to bring "guilt" upon the people.² In the present series *he shall bear his iniquity* appears as equivalent to *he shall be guilty*;³ so that the idea of guiltiness is that of liability to the penalty of sin. In the former series of sin-offerings it has been shown that disobedience to the commands of God, even though committed unwittingly, rendered the transgressor liable to death. The present series contemplates a number of cases

¹ Lev. v, 11, 12,

² *Ib.* iv, 3,

³ *Ib.* v, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,

which were likely to happen and in one way or another concerned the sacredness of the Divine Name. Each and all of these, although excuses might be offered for them, and although there had been no intention of disrespect, must still be recognized as involving the individual in guilt, and called for confession, and for an offering to cover the iniquity.

The cases which are mentioned are three in number :

(1) There is the case of a witness upon oath who declines to give information. This is not of course the bearing of false witness, which is a deliberate disobedience to Divine commands, and under no circumstances admitted of a sin-offering for atonement. Nor is it contemplated that the witness is partner with the wrong-doer, and on this account hears the adjuration and answers nothing.¹ But it is probable that the case of a witness is here in view who for fear of the consequences to himself or to his family shrinks from telling what he knows. All those who have lived amongst Eastern nations, where protection for life and property is less secure, and where private vengeance is transmitted almost as a sacred trust from generation to generation, will acknowledge the force which fear exercises upon a witness called to tell all he knows of the actions of any strong doer of wrong. The temptation to a man so situated to conceal the truth would be great. But there is more concerned than the personal convenience of the witness. The sacredness of the Divine Name of Him in whose presence the enquiry is being conducted calls for the whole truth to be spoken at all costs. To such an adjuration our Lord Jesus Himself responded without hesitation or reserve, and at the cost of His life. For the honour of God is greater than the safety of men. At the same time the mercy of God recognizes the weakness of men, and the force of fear to overcome the voice of conscience ; and offers in such cases, when conscience once more reasserts itself, to strengthen by confession that which had been weakened by denial, and also to provide a means by which the guilt of the weak denial may be removed. (2) Another case is where defilement by touching the dead bodies of unclean animals or any uncleanness of man had been contracted unknowingly. This seems to anticipate the rules which God was about to lay down, distinguishing between the clean and the unclean animals, and also concerning defilement through contact with dead bodies, and the uncleanness of men.² But it is almost certain that some customs or

¹ Prov. xxix. 24.

² Lev. xi.-xv.

laws on these subjects were already known amongst the Israelites.¹ It is probable that the laws of ceremonial uncleanness, and of purification from defilement, were a regulation and perhaps also an extension of existing customs rather than the introduction of an entirely new institution. But at all events it was the Divine intention to ordain certain restrictions and ceremonial purifications, calculated to remind the Israelites of their special connection with a holy God.² It might well happen then in the future that a man contracted some ceremonial defilement without noticing it, and consequently omitted the prescribed purification. As soon as he became aware of the fact, he must not regard it as a mere accident, but must confess his defilement, and acknowledge that he is worthy of death because of his continuance in a state of impurity before his holy God. There can be no doubt that one object of these ceremonial laws was to impress upon the Israelites the sanctity of the Divine Name by which they were called; and a neglect of those laws, even if unwitting, was an offence against that Holy Name. (3) The third case which is mentioned is that of rash swearing by the Name of God, either to do good or to do evil. *Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God, for God is in heaven and thou upon earth, therefore let thy words be few,*³ is the advice of the wise Preacher. We may instance as Bible examples of such rash oaths the curse of Saul which he was unable to carry out,⁴ the curse of David from which the Lord Himself intervened to turn him aside,⁵ the foolish oath of Herod when he was merry with wine,⁶ and the mad fury of the more than forty men who bound themselves under a curse that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul.⁷ Saul found himself unable to carry out what he had undertaken, and David found that he had sworn to do an evil thing, and abandoned his purpose. Both must have stood self-convicted of rash swearing. But it was no light thing to call the Holy One to witness a promise, and then to belie His Name through failure to perform it. Excuses of haste or passion or heedlessness did not exonerate from guilt. The sinner must make confession and bring his sin-offering for atonement. The present law of sin-offerings then was ordained with a view to impressing upon the Israelites the sanctity of the Divine Name. Jehovah is jealous for His Holy Name; and the man

¹ Gen. xxxv. 2; Exod. xix. 14, 15, 22; xx. 25, 26; and comp. Gen. xxvi. 5.

² Lev. xi. 43-45.

³ Eccl. v. 2.

⁴ 1 Sam. xiv. 24, 39.

⁵ 1b. xxv. 22,

⁶ Matt. xiv. 7.

⁷ Acts xxiii. 12.

who takes that Name in vain, whether through fear or heedlessness, is guilty of death.

The first series of sin-offerings was ordained for cases of unwitting disobedience to God's commands, which illustrates the nature of sin as being a violation of the law under which men live, and entailing as a consequence fatal effects upon them. The second series is ordained for cases of unwitting profanation of the Divine Name, which suggests that sin is no mere violation of impersonal law, but is indeed an offence against the majesty and holiness of that Divine Person in whose image man was created. We feel that when men commit sin, even when it is done without premeditation, they not only violate the order into which they were created, but they prostitute the Divine image which was impressed upon them; they oppose the will of God, and they belie the nature of God. On both these accounts they stand guilty, and guilty of death. These complementary truths concerning the nature and effects of sin are to be found in the earlier revelation of the Fall; they are now illustrated and enforced by the law of the sin-offerings. We think that taken together they give a complete conception of sin, and that this is the reason why two series of sin-offerings were given together at this time.

It is interesting to note in connection with sins which involved a profanation of the Holy Name, that Jehovah shows His willingness, we may almost say His eagerness, that no soul of man, however humble, should be deterred from recognizing his sin and seeking atonement for it. The regular offering for sins of this kind was a female lamb or goat. But if means did not suffice for this, two turtle-doves or two young pigeons might be brought instead. If even this could not be procured, then one-tenth of an ephah of flour would be accepted, an offering which must have been within the power of the poorest to provide. This Divine solicitude, if we may so express it, may suggest to us that this is not only the deepest, but the tenderest view of sin, which God would have all to confess and to feel. He would have all men to understand that *He* is the author of the order of Nature and *Himself* the Pattern of our nature; and that transgression of the laws of our nature and environment is to dishonour Him.

But we must now consider the law of this second series of sin-offerings.

Of the first alternative offering of a lamb or goat it is simply said that *he shall bring his trespass-offering unto Jehovah for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the*

flock, a lamb or a goat, for a sin-offering ; and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin. There can be no doubt that the ritual was to follow exactly the ritual prescribed for a lamb and for a goat in the first series of sin-offerings, and therefore was not given again in full.

The ritual in the second case, when two turtle-doves or two young pigeons formed the offering, is given in fuller detail. Here we may notice the exact correspondence with the ritual of the larger sin-offerings. One bird is used for the sin-offering proper, and the other is used for a burnt-offering to correspond with the burnt-offering of the fat taken from the lamb or goat of the sin-offering. As regards the bird for a sin-offering, we observe that the distinctive points of the sin-offering ritual are all marked. The rite of presentation of the blood is here represented by the direction, *he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar.*¹ It will be remembered that the rite of presentation of the blood is absent from all the sacrifices of peace-offerings, and also from every burnt-offering except when taken from the herd ; but here we see that it finds a place in even the smallest variety of sin-offering. In the sin-offering then the blood was always presented, either by an act of sprinkling, whether before the mercy-seat or before the veil ; or by being put upon the horns of the golden and brazen altars, or at the very least, as here, by sprinkling upon the side of the brazen altar. The connection between the blood-shedding of the victim and the altar of burnt-offering is also specially marked in every form of sin-offerings. In all the other offerings this connection is established by sprinkling the blood round about upon the altar, or, in the case of a burnt-offering of birds, draining it out on the side of the altar ; but in the sin-offerings the remainder of the blood is all to be poured out at the base of the altar, and accordingly here also we read that *the rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the altar.*² We notice also that as the rites of presentation and pouring out of the blood at the base of the altar preceded the burnt-offering of the fat in the greater sin-offerings, so also here the bird of the sin-offering was first to be offered, and afterwards that for the burnt-offering. After the offering of the burnt-offering according to the regular ritual, the whole concludes with the words, which we have seen to be essential to the idea of the sin-offering, *the priest shall make atonement for him as concern-*

¹ Lev. v. 9.² *Ib.*

*ing his sin which he hath sinned; and also with the assurance that he shall be forgiven.*¹

We come now to the third and last alternative sin-offering. *If his means suffice not for two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, then he shall bring his oblation for that wherein he hath sinned, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering; he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon; for it is a sin-offering.* Here we are at once struck by the fact that blood-shedding, which we have come to regard as the very core and substance of a sin-offering, and without which there can be no atonement or forgiveness, appears to be totally absent. And yet this is declared to be a sin-offering, and the ritual closes as usual with the assurance, *the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in any of these things, and he shall be forgiven.* To this strange phenomenon we must now direct our attention, sure, however, that there can be no real contradiction to what has been so unmistakably emphasized in the previous law of sin-offerings, and to what we know to be an eternal fact that without shedding of blood there is no remission.

We have already remarked that the reduction of the sin-offering to the lowest possible limits, so as to secure from the humblest and poorest of His people the due recognition of His Holy Name, and to implant His fear in their hearts, is a touching proof of the love of God towards all mankind. It is in exact accordance with the whole witness of the Bible. *The rich and the poor meet together; Jehovah is the Maker of them all.*² All souls are His,³ and the good news of the Gospel is proclaimed to every creature, whatever his condition. But however deeply the heart of God yearns over those who are careless of the honour of His Name, and calls them to repentance, which is their life, His love can flow to men by no other way than through the channel of atonement; and without the surrender of life there can be no atonement for sin. This truth is not likely to be lost sight of anywhere in the ritual of sin-offerings for atonement, and we shall find that it is present here. In the first place we notice that the fine flour which is here offered is sharply distinguished from the meal-offering. In the case of a meal-offering of fine flour, it had been ordained that oil should be poured upon it, and frankincense added to it.⁴ Both these are expressly excluded in the present case, and the reason for their exclusion is given

¹ Verse 10.

² Prov. xxii. 2.

³ Ezek. xviii. 4.

⁴ Lev. ii. 1.

in the words *for it is a sin-offering*; implying that the fine flour in this case was not to be regarded as a meal-offering, but as a sin-offering, strange though it might seem. The thoughtful Israelite may have wondered in what way the offering of fine flour could take the place of that blood-shedding which he knew to be the sole and only means of atonement for sin.¹ He may have noticed that this offering of flour was distinguished from the meal-offering not only by the absence of oil and frankincense, but by being fixed in quantity. In the law of meal-offerings the amount of the offering was not fixed,² and in fact it varied in quantity according to the sacrificial victim with which it was offered. In the present case, however, the amount is fixed to the tenth part of an ephah. It is quite possible that the Israelite would recall the connection of this measure with his daily provision of manna. Not many weeks had passed since the manna was first given, when Jehovah fixed *an omer a head*³ as the daily sustenance of the people. This was further emphasized by an initial miracle. When the children of Israel first gathered the manna, some gathered more and some less, but when they measured it with the omer, he that gathered much was found to have nothing over, while he that gathered little had no lack. This incident must have impressed itself upon the minds of the people, and much more so when exactly an omerful of manna was collected by Divine command and stored in the tent of meeting. Now an omer is the tenth part of an ephah,⁴ and when the Israelite found that exactly this quantity of flour was ordained to take the place of the surrendered life of the ordinary sin-offerings, he may at once have grasped the meaning of the symbolism. The tenth part of an ephah of flour represented the daily bread of a man, and its being surrendered to God was a true, if faint, picture of a life-surrender. The ritual proceeds; *he shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it as the memorial thereof, and burn it on the altar, upon the offerings of Jehovah made by fire; it is a sin-offering*. We take the burning of a handful of the meal upon the fire-offerings to be a true burnt-offering; so that the idea of consecration may be illustrated as well as that of life-surrender. The same thing was done in the case of a meal-offering of fine flour. A handful of the meal, and some of the oil, together with all the frankincense, were taken by the priest and burnt upon the altar as the memorial of the

¹ Lev. xvii. 11.² *Ib.* 12.³ Exod. xvi. 16.⁴ *Ib.* 36.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The ritual for the Day of Atonement is contained in Lev. XVI.

Its connection with the series of Religious Festivals is given in Lev. XXIII. 26-32; XXV. 9.

The special festival offerings for the day are prescribed in Num. XXIX. 7-11.

THE NAME.

✓ THE name Day of Atonement, or, more literally, Day of Atonements, occurs in Lev. XXIII. 27, 28 and XXV. 9 only. When giving directions for the construction of the Tabernacle God had already intimated His intention of establishing an annual service of atonement, but without defining the time or manner in which it was to take place (Exod. XXX. 10). The actual institution was announced *after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they drew near before Jehovah and died*, and seems to have borne some reference to the rash act of Nadab and Abihu. It may be that they had not only sinned by burning incense with strange fire, and possibly also by doing so in company; but that they were pressing forward into the sanctuary itself; and that it is with reference to this unauthorized intrusion that *Jehovah said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat which is upon the ark, that he die not; for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat*. But it is noticeable that no less than six oracles intervene between the account of the death of Nadab and Abihu and the institution of the Day of Atonement, with its restriction of entry into the holiest place. These oracles¹ are concerned respectively with the distinction between clean and unclean animals and uncleanness by contact with dead bodies; with

¹ Lev. XI.-XV.

the purification of women after childbirth; with the uncleanness of leprosy; with the law of cleansing lepers; with the law of leprosy in houses; and with other ceremonial uncleannesses of various kinds. Immediately after these six oracles, which we may suppose to have been given soon after the death of Nadab and Abihu, and perhaps as much in connection with the oracles as with the death of these priests, the law of the Day of Atonement was made known. Enough had been said by God to make the people realize their essential uncleanness in His sight, and an illustration had lately been given by the two sons of Aaron of the sinful infirmities of the priests; just at this time, then, Jehovah speaks to institute an annual Day of Atonement, by which there might be made a remembrance of these sins year by year, and also a symbolic atonement for them. There seems no need, then, to suppose that the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus is not in its strict chronological position, as it seems to be logically connected with the preceding chapters.

It is well known that there is no allusion to the Day of Atonement in the Old Testament outside the Books of Moses. This has sometimes been held to be an argument against the genuineness of the history which we are considering, but the argument from silence is always unreliable. Our hypothesis, moreover, is that the records which we are studying are trustworthy, and if we find that they are logically consistent with themselves, we are not disturbed by such counter arguments as these. As it has been well remarked, the historical note with which the law is introduced "is perfectly natural if we have here a narrative dating from Mosaic days, but which seems most objectless and unlikely to have been entered, if the law were a late invention of Rabbinical forgers".¹ To what extent the law of Moses was observed during the wilderness wanderings, under the judges, and in the first temple, we feel unable to give a decided answer. But it may well be that no occasion would arise for allusion to the annual Day of Atonement in either the historical or prophetic writings. This, then, we accept as a sufficient reason for the phenomenon to which we have drawn attention.

In the Talmud the Day of Atonement is simply "The Day," and some have considered it possible that Heb. vii. 27 may be translated, *He hath not on each day* (i.e. *on each day of atonement*) *necessity, as the high-priests have, to offer up sacri-*

¹ "Expositor's Bible—Leviticus," p. 258.

fices first for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people. Bishop Westcott, however, who discusses this difficult verse at length in his Commentary on the Hebrews, decides against this interpretation. He explains the verse as meaning, "He hath not daily necessity [in the daily fulfilment of His intercessory work], as the high-priests [have necessity on each occasion when they fulfil them] to offer sacrifices. . . ."

✓ The Day of Atonement was also referred to as The Fast (Acts xxvii. 9), being the only fast ordained by the Mosaic Law.

We have spoken of the annual Day of Atonement as being a periodical rectification as it were of tabernacle, priest, and altar, by which they were symbolically cleansed, and once more made like their heavenly pattern.¹ This we believe to be one main purpose of this remarkable institution.

On the tenth day of the seventh month of each year the whole tabernacle system was for some hours in abeyance while priest and tabernacle and altar were being cleansed, and so to speak renewed for a further period of service. After the regular morning burnt-offering with its meal- and drink-offerings had been offered,² all the usual ministry was suspended, while a service of atonement and cleansing was performed. When this service was completed, the high priest resumed his official garments, burnt-offerings were once more offered, and the ordinary routine of sacrificial worship recommenced. The details of this solemn annual cleansing and covering of sin were of course adapted to the eternal verities of actual atonement, and herein lies the interest and the wonder of this unique legislation.

We consider first then the emphasis which is here laid upon the fact of sin. Atonement has to be made for the holy sanctuary, for the tent of meeting, for the altar, for the priests, and for all the people of the assembly.³ Although the anointed priest at his consecration had been made like the Son of God, yet he and his house were after all but erring sinful men, those who survived in the office no less so than those who had died, and of this fact there is a remembrance made every year. The inferior priests are for a time excluded from the tabernacle,⁴ while the anointed priest himself enters only by blood and under a cloud of incense, kindled by fire from the altar of sacrifice.⁵ But while this is

¹ Ch. ix. p. 126.

⁴ Verse 17.

² Num. xxix. 11.

⁵ Verses 12-14.

³ Lev. xvi. 33.

easily understood, it is not so obvious in what sense the holy sanctuary, the tent of meeting, and the altar, are regarded as defiled and in need of cleansing. We have seen that tabernacle and altar, like the anointed priest, had been made like the Son of God, both in their construction and by certain symbolic rites. In what way had they become defiled and in need of cleansing? This question is answered for us in the words, *He shall make atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even all their sins ; and so shall he do for the tent of meeting, that dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleannesses ; and again, he shall hallow the altar from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel.*¹ The uncleanness which attaches to these sacred places is then the uncleanness of the children of Israel amongst whom they are placed. If an individual man is chosen to be in the likeness of the true Mediator between God and men, he must be initially consecrated by a long series of symbolic rites, so as to present some real correspondence with the truth. He must also be constantly reminded himself, and the people must be reminded too, of the imperfection of his symbolic representation on account of his actual sinfulness. But there is not the same disability in unconscious and irresponsible things to represent the true mediation. Once made in the likeness of the true Mediator, they would remain in that likeness without change. Accordingly the uncleanness which attaches to these, and which is in need of cleansing, is expressly referred to as the uncleanness of the people, and not of themselves. The fact was a very forcible reminder to *all the people of the assembly*² of their uncleanness through sins.

In these ways the institution of the Day of Atonement brought sins to remembrance. But while it brought sins to remembrance, it also showed that sins might be covered. It was distinctively the Day of *Atonement*. The word "atonement" occurs no less than sixteen times in the course of this short oracle ; and the object of the day's service is finally summed up in the words, *he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary ; and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar ; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly ; and this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make atonement for the children of Israel because of all their sins once in the year.*³ We have seen

¹ Verses 16, 19.² Verse 33.³ Verses 33, 34.

above that the effect of a burnt-offering was to make atonement for the offerer,¹ and we have found that it did so on account of the surrender of life by the victim. This truth has been specially emphasized in the law of sin-offerings, where the object of atonement for particular unwitting sins is specially in view. But it is reserved for the ritual of the Day of Atonement to give a complete representation of the fact of atonement *for all the sins* of the children of Israel. It is true that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring to the services of this day, speaks of the high priest entering the holiest place alone once in the year, not without blood, which he offers for himself and for *the ignorances* of the people.² Some have thought accordingly that the sins which were atoned for on the Day of Atonement were only the *unrecognized* ceremonial uncleannesses and moral delinquencies of the people. We believe, however, that there is no limitation of this kind implied in the words of the institution, nor does the writer to the Hebrews assert it. We think on the contrary that the often repeated assurance that the atonement is for *all the sins*³ of the people, and the definite statement that it is for *all* the assembly,⁴ are to be taken in their widest sense. But this does not imply that the atonement took universal effect irrespective of the attitude of individuals towards it. It is expressly stipulated that a solemn fast is to be observed by all, and that all are to abstain from work upon the Day of Atonement. *It shall be a statute for ever unto you ; in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and shall do no manner of work, the home-born or the stranger that sojourneth among you ; for on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you ; from all your sins shall ye be clean before Jehovah. It is a sabbath of solemn rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls ; it is a statute for ever.*⁵ And in a later enactment it is made even more clear that a share in the benefits of the atonement which was being made was entirely conditional on the observance of both points of this statute. *Whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day ; he shall be cut off from his people. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any manner of work in that same day, that soul will I destroy from among his people.*⁶ There is demanded from the people some real humiliation on account of their sins, and a real adherence to the work of atonement made on their behalf, and there is promised to them on the fulfilment of these conditions that

¹ Lev. i. 4.⁴ Verse 33.² Heb. ix. 7.⁵ Verses 29-31.³ Verses 16, 21, 30, 34.⁶ Lev. xxiii. 29, 30.

from all their sins they shall be clean before Jehovah. The condition and the promise alike are framed to correspond with the terms of the Gospel message. *Repent ye, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.*¹ *The things which God foreshowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that His Christ should suffer, He has fulfilled. Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out.*²

But we must now examine this great picture of atonement. It is the most elaborated picture which the Old Testament contains of the work of Christ in covering sin. It is a sin-offering for atonement of course, but it is more than this, as we shall see in the sequel.

We notice in the first place how the whole ritual centres round the bullock which is the sin-offering for Aaron, and the two he-goats which are the sin-offering for the people. It is true that there is a ram provided as a burnt-offering for Aaron, and one also as a burnt-offering for the people. But the ritual with these follows when the offering of the sin-offerings is completed, and is dismissed in a single sentence, *he shall come forth and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people,*³ with the significant addition, *and make atonement for himself and for the people*, as if even the burnt-offerings upon this day spoke chiefly the message of atonement by blood-shedding.

The ritual of the sin-offering for Aaron and that for the people followed the usual ritual for sin-offerings in (1) the presentation of the blood before Jehovah, (2) a connection of the blood with the altar, (3) the burning of the fat as a burnt-offering upon the altar, (4) the consuming by fire of the remainder of the carcass. Upon each of these points we will say a few words.

1. As regards the presentation of the blood. In both the sin-offerings of this day the blood was brought near *within the veil*. We have noticed in our study of the offerings generally that it is only the chief offering of any particular class which gives a complete picture of that which is illustrated. And this is true also of the sin-offering. The fact of a presentation of the blood of atonement before Jehovah after it has been shed is marked in every form of sin-offering; but it finds complete expression only in the chief sin-offerings of all, namely, the sin-offerings of the Day of Atonement. Here we

¹ Acts II. 38.² Acts III. 18, 19.³ Lev. xvi. 24.

find that the blood is taken into that place where there is manifested the very presence of God Himself, *for, says He, I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.*¹ The correspondence with the facts of real atonement is clear. Our Christ having put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself entered into Heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us.² We regard the taking of the blood within the veil as symbolic of this entry of the Lamb who had been slain into the presence of God.

But it is clear from the ritual of this day that the blood which was taken within the veil did more than bring into the presence of God the token of a finished work of atonement on behalf of Aaron and of the people. That it did do this is indeed expressly stated;³ but it is also said that atonement was made thereby for the holy place.⁴ We have already observed that with a view to bringing home to the Israelite conscience a sense of sinfulness, the tabernacle and altar which were resident among them were regarded as defiled by their sins, and in need of cleansing. It was proper then that the blood which atoned for the sins of the people should also cleanse the sanctuary and altar. But it may well be asked whether this cleansing of the tabernacle and altar by the blood of atonement corresponds to any fact of the real atonement. We think that this question is answered by an inspired writer. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read that Moses sprinkled the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry with blood. *And according to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed by blood, and apart from shedding of blood there is no remission. It was necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us.*⁵ This inspired comment states that the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry were sprinkled with blood by Moses; a fact which is not found in the history. At the time of the ratification of the covenant of which the writer to the Hebrews has just been speaking, the tabernacle of course was not in existence; nor do we read at the consecration of the tabernacle and priesthood⁶ that Moses sprinkled the tabernacle with blood, but only that he anointed "the tabernacle and all that was therein" with oil. The blood was

¹ Verse 2.⁴ Verse 16.² Heb. ix. 24-26.⁵ Heb. ix. 21-24.³ Verse 17.⁶ Lev. viii.

sprinkled at that time, so far as the record informs us, upon the priest only.¹ It is true that Josephus speaks of Moses sprinkling the tabernacle with blood, as well as anointing it with oil on this occasion, and this may have been a true Jewish tradition² adopted by the writer to the Hebrews. But there is nothing to show that he has the consecration of the tabernacle in his mind, and not, as we are inclined rather to believe, the Day of Atonement. If indeed he is referring to the Day of Atonement, his meaning must be not that Moses personally sprinkled the tabernacle, but that he ordained such a sprinkling. The blood of the Day of Atonement is essentially the blood of the covenant, of which the writer has just been speaking, and he who actually sprinkled the people with the blood of the covenant on the day of its initial ratification, ordained also that the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry should be sprinkled in like manner with the blood, on each occasion of the annual renewal of the covenant; and indeed, according to the law, one may almost say that blood is the invariable instrument of cleansing. But even if the reference be to the Day of Atonement, a difficulty remains in the fact that, so far as the records inform us, the sprinkling upon that day was only upon and before the mercy-seat and upon the altar of burnt-offering. For the highest kind of sin-offering for an unwitting sin, the ritual prescribed a sprinkling in the holy place before the veil, and a putting of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense. Neither of these ritual acts is mentioned in the ordinance of the Day of Atonement; the former very probably did not take place, as the blood had already been sprinkled within the veil; but the latter is expressly prescribed for the annual act of atonement in an earlier oracle. God had said of the altar of incense from the beginning that *Aaron shall make atonement upon the horns of it once in the year; with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement once in the year shall he make atonement for it throughout your generations.*³ We gather then from the Mosaic narrative that blood was applied, either by sprinkling or by other means, upon and before the mercy-seat in the holiest place, upon the golden altar in the holy place, and also upon the altar of burnt-offering in the court of the tabernacle. The effect of this was that the

¹ It was also put upon the horns of the brazen altar to cleanse it (Lev. VIII. 15).

² Compare in the near context the mention of water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and the sprinkling of the Book, all which are (traditional) additions to the Mosaic narrative.

³ Exod. xxx. 10.

sanctuary, and the tent of meeting, and the altar were all cleansed. The application of blood to the chief objects in each division is in fact a cleansing of the tabernacle and all the vessels of ministry. It has seemed worth while to discuss this slight difficulty in some detail; but the important thing is to observe that the tabernacle and its service are stated to be copies of heavenly things; and the writer says that they were cleansed by the blood of animals because the heavenly things themselves are cleansed by the blood of Christ. What are these heavenly things which are cleansed by the blood of Christ? We have seen that tabernacle and altar are copies of Christ; but it is evident that in the present connection this is not the likeness which is in view. We have also seen that the ministry in the holy place is a picture of the Godward life of man, perfectly exemplified in the Son of Man, but realized also to some degree in the life of all who are in Him. The altar of burnt-offering again is a picture not only of the acceptable service rendered by the Substitute and Representative of men, but also of their own works of devoted service raised to God as the savour of a sweet smell. This Godward life of men and their reasonable service are spiritual realities in heavenly places to which tabernacle and altar are made like. But in so far as *we* touch golden altar, or candlestick, or table, or altar of sweet savour, impurity clings to them all. Neither prayer, nor spiritual insight, nor active service, nor acts of devotion are free from sin. The iniquities of our holy things need cleansing, and they are cleansed by the blood of Christ. But the symbolism seems to lead us beyond the holy place to the holiest of all, and to show the need of cleansing even there. The writer to the Hebrews takes this to be a copy of *Heaven itself*, where in bodily presence Christ has entered in, and *appears before the face of God*. But he says also in another place that we too may enter there, and draw near to the throne.¹ That we do so at present only in a heavenly and spiritual manner does not make it any the less real. In the words of the familiar hymn:—

From every stormy wind that blows,
From every swelling tide of woes,
There is a calm, a sure retreat;
'Tis found beneath the mercy-seat.

There, there on eagle wing we soar,
And time and sense seem all no more,
And heaven comes down our souls to greet,
And glory crowns the mercy-seat.

¹ Heb. iv. 14-16; x. 19-22.

And yet we are sinful men and women, is not the very holiest place defiled? So it is indeed; but it is also cleansed by the blood of Christ. Can it be that this is the apostle's meaning when he writes, *It was the good pleasure of the Father that in Him should all the fulness dwell; and through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, I say, whether things upon earth, or things in the heavens?*¹

2. We come now to consider the connection of the blood with the altar. A remarkable omission is to be noted here. We have seen that in the ritual of sin-offerings it is the invariable rule that all the blood which remained over after the rites of presentation was to be poured out at the base of the altar, and we have explained this as symbolic of the fact that the Death of Christ lies at the base of all His work for us, as well as of our acceptable service of God through Him. But in the ritual for the sin-offerings of the Day of Atonement this rite finds no mention whatever. We think that it is not unlikely that the blood was actually so disposed of according to the recognized rule for sin-offerings. But whether this was so or not, it is clear that our attention is not directed to this point of symbolism, but rather to the application of blood to the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and the sprinkling of the blood upon it seven times so as to cleanse it. The cleansing of the holiest place then was effected by putting the blood upon the mercy-seat, and sprinkling blood before it seven times; a cleansing in which the holy place participated, although it had its own token of cleansing also in the putting of blood upon the horns of the golden altar; finally we see that the brazen altar was cleansed by affusion of blood upon its horns, and sprinkling of blood seven times upon its surface. The sevenfold sprinkling was no doubt symbolic of a perfect cleansing. It follows that the blood-shedding of Jesus Christ is the basic fact which makes it possible for men to serve God, to live towards God, or to stand in the presence of God. The truth is essentially the same as that which was symbolized by the pouring out of the blood of the sin-offering at the base of the altar.

3. As regards the burning of the fat of the two sin-offerings, we notice that this is provided for in the direction, *the fat of the sin-offering shall he burn upon the altar;*² for that which is symbolized by this rite is an essential part of the work of

¹ Col. i. 19, 20.

² Verse 25.

Christ on our behalf. But it is worthy of remark that in this ritual, where the illustration of the truth of atonement is specially in view, this act is separated in a marked manner from the work of atonement. The priest on this occasion *makes an end of atoning*¹ before the fat of the sin-offerings is burnt upon the altar. The suggestion is true to the teaching of Scripture that it is peculiarly the life-surrender of Jesus Christ which atones for sin.

4. As regards the consuming of the flesh of the victim, the ritual follows the usual custom for sin-offerings. *The bullock of the sin-offering and the goat of the sin-offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall be carried forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung.*² We have already spoken of the significance of this act, as corresponding to the fact that the true Sin-offering was expelled from the Jewish assembly and carried outside their city, and that there His holy mortal flesh became an immortal spiritual body, and was finally removed from human view and daily contact. The essential sanctity of the flesh of the sin-offerings is also marked by the direction that *he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp.*³ We have no hesitation in explaining this rule by the general principle of sin-offerings, that *whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy.*⁴ The bathing of his flesh and washing of his clothes by the man who burnt the bodies of the sin-offerings is parallel to the washing in a holy place of a garment on which their blood had been sprinkled, or to the breaking of an earthen vessel or rinsing of a metal vessel in which their flesh had been boiled. The object is to emphasize the fact that the blood and the flesh are most holy, and impart their holiness to that which they touch. Objects and persons which share in the holiness of the sin-offering by contact with it must then be symbolically freed from this imparted holiness before they may be put to other uses, or mix freely in the life of the camp. We do not forget that in the law of ceremonial uncleannesses the washing of clothes and bathing in water is the regular ceremony of cleansing from impurity,⁵ or that an earthen vessel which has been defiled is to be broken, and a wooden vessel rinsed.⁶ But it is important to notice that in all these

¹ Verse 20. The atonement made by the *sin-offerings* was now completed, whether for priest and people (verse 17), or for the holy place, the tent of meeting, and the altar (verse 20). The atonement of verse 24 is made with the burnt-offerings.

² Verse 27.

³ Verse 28.

⁴ Lev. vi. 27.

⁵ *Ib.* xv. *passim*.

⁶ *Ib.* 12; xi. 33, 35.

cases of washing and bathing the meaning of the ceremony is clearly indicated, either as at once restoring ceremonial cleanness,¹ or restoring it at even.² And as regards the breaking or rinsing of vessels, the fact of their uncleanness is either mentioned or implied as the reason for the action. In the present case, on the contrary, we do not read, "he that burneth them shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and he shall be clean," or "and he shall be unclean until the even," but "*and afterward he shall come into the camp*".³ It is evident that the object is not to remove impurity, but to guard against desecration of holy things. Bathing and washing need not only imply the removal of impurities, they may symbolize equally well the liberation of imparted properties of any kind, as for example of holiness. And this we have no doubt is the meaning of the present regulation. It seems to be an essential element in the law of sin-offerings to emphasize the sacred character of the true Sin-offering. Those exalted beings who stand in the presence of God understand best the meaning of Divine holiness, and it is one of these who calls Him who is appointed to finish⁴ transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, *the Most Holy*.⁵ This same Gabriel it is also who is sent to tell Mary that *that which is to be born of her shall be called holy, the Son of God*.⁶

The rite of the Day of Atonement is then a sin-offering of peculiar fulness and solemnity. But there are certain additional peculiarities about the service which we must now examine in detail.

In the first place we are struck by the position which Aaron holds in the service of atonement. At the commencement of the special rites of this day we read: *He shall put on the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with the linen girdle, and with the linen mitre shall he be attired; they are the holy garments; and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and put them on*.⁷ At the conclusion of the atonement we read, *Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there; and he shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth, and offer his burnt-offering*

¹ Lev. xv. 13.

² *Ib.* 5 and *passim*.

³ Contrast Num. xix. 7.

⁴ The Hebrew word is akin to that translated "make an end of" in Lev. xvi. 20.

⁵ Dan. ix. 24.

⁶ Luke i. 35, marg.

⁷ Verse 4.

*and the burnt-offering of the people, and make atonement for himself and for the people.*¹

It seems clear from these directions that during the service of atonement Aaron was clothed in special vestments. These are described as the holy linen coat, the linen breeches, the linen girdle, and the linen mitre. It is natural to suppose that these are the same as the breeches, coat, girdle, and mitre of the high priest described in a former chapter of this book.² But on the other hand, it may be doubted whether "the linen girdle" was not of white linen only, and so different from the ordinary girdle of fine twined linen, embroidered with the three colours.³ It is generally assumed that the high priest's dress on this occasion was wholly white, without the admixture of any colour, but it cannot be said that this is directed in the law. We regard the present regulation rather as symbolic of a pause in the high-priestly ministry. The ministry of Aaron and of his house is temporarily in abeyance, while the annual atonement is being effected. But some minister is required to perform the service, and the high priest is obviously the only person who is admissible for the purpose. He must therefore do so, but divested of his chief robes of office, and clothed only in what was essential for reverence and decency. The bathing of his flesh in water before putting on these garments has the same significance. Aaron had already been bathed at his consecration,⁴ and thenceforward as high priest had put on his vestments at all times without further ceremonial. But now his position is for the time in abeyance; he is acting not as the high priest, but as the appointed minister of atonement for Tabernacle, Altar, Priesthood, and People; as such he bathes himself and puts on priestly vestments. At the close of the service of atonement he returns to the tent of meeting, and puts off the linen garments, leaving them there; he then bathes his flesh in water in a holy place; puts on a fresh set of breeches, coat, girdle, and mitre,⁵ together with the full high-priestly vestments; and fully arrayed again as high priest he comes forth and performs his usual functions. The obvious meaning of these rites is that the whole system of tabernacle worship and ministry is for a time suspended

¹ Verses 23, 24.

² Ch. VIII. p. 100.

³ Exod. XXXIX. 29. We may compare the use of the phrase "a linen ephod" to distinguish it from the embroidered ephod. The definite article used with each of these vestments points, however, to their being the regular vestments of the high priest.

⁴ Lev. VIII. 6. Moses washed him with water: here he bathes himself.

⁵ It is quite possible that the mitre in which he had been officiating had not the holy crown attached to it.

until atonement has been effected, when it is again resumed as before.

It will be seen that whether we regard the vestments used on this occasion as a special set of white vestments, or as being the ordinary, though incomplete, vestiture of the high priests, the result is the same. They were put on by him not as his own vestments, but for a special act of comprehensive atonement. When the act is accomplished, he separates himself, as it were, from his temporary position, first by divesting himself entirely of his vestments, and leaving them in the tabernacle; next by bathing his flesh in water in a holy place. By these two actions he became separated, as it were, from the properties which had for a time attached to him, and resumed his position as high priest, only now a high priest who had been atoned for, serving in a tabernacle which had been cleansed. The very fact of his at once offering burnt-offerings for atonement, clothed in his full official vestments, showed that the rectification of the whole tabernacle system had been effective and complete.

It will be seen that we regard the second bathing not as significant of cleansing from impurity, but of separation from an imparted sanctity. We think that this is implied by the direction that the bathing is to be *in a holy place*. In the same way the linen garments which Aaron *put on when he went into the holy place* are regarded as possessing a special sanctity, and therefore are to be put off and left in the tabernacle itself, possibly in the entrance to it. At the conclusion of the whole service there can be no doubt that these also were washed in a holy place, according to the regular rule,¹ and afterwards were again available for use.

It follows from what has been said that the emphasis of the ritual of the Day of Atonement lies more upon the work of atonement than upon the person of the atoner. The high priest falls, as it were, into the background, while the blood fills the picture. At the same time there is seen no other victim and no other priest than we have been accustomed to see in all the offerings.

There remains for consideration that ceremonial of the scapegoat which is such an outstanding feature of the services of the Day of Atonement.

With regard to this we notice first that the scapegoat is identified with the other goat. Aaron was to take of the congregation of the children of Israel *two he-goats for a sin-offering*.²

¹ Lev. vi. 27.

² Verse 5.

The two goats together therefore formed the sin-offering of the people. In accordance with this both goats were *set before Jehovah* at the door of the tent of meeting.¹ It was Jehovah Himself who decided by the lot which goat was to be offered according to the sin-offering ritual, and which was to be reserved for another ceremonial. The identity of the two animals, which was marked in these ways, did not escape the notice of the Jews. Dr. Edersheim, writing of the Temple services in the time of our Lord, says that according to Jewish custom "the two goats must be altogether alike in look, size, and value; indeed so earnestly was it sought to carry out the idea that these two formed parts of one and the same sacrifice, that it was arranged that they should, if possible, even be purchased at the same time".² This is indeed a point of prime importance in the interpretation of the ceremonial, for it assures us that we are to see in the goat which was let go into the wilderness, no less than in the goat which was offered according to the sin-offering ritual, a likeness to Christ.

The two goats then were to be *set before Jehovah at the door of the tent of meeting. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel*. We meet here with the word Azazel, which occurs in the Bible only in this chapter of Leviticus, and which the Authorized Version renders "the scapegoat," while the Revisers have been content to transliterate the original word, with the alternative rendering "removal" in the margin. "The word is by universal consent derived from a root which means '*wholly to put aside*' or '*wholly to go away*'".³ The words *for Azazel* may then mean "for being wholly separated" or "for being put wholly aside or away," a sense which is given very fairly by the marginal rendering of the Revisers, *for removal*. We think it quite certain that Azazel is not a proper name, as if Azazel were one person and Jehovah were another, one goat being destined for Jehovah and the other for Azazel. This is made clear for one thing by the association of the two goats as a single sin-offering,⁴ and the setting of both together before Jehovah.⁵ It is made clearer still by the goat on which the lot fell for Azazel continuing to be set before Jehovah.⁶ It may also be remarked that after the decision of the lot the goats are not spoken of as "the goat for Jehovah" and "the goat for Azazel," but as *the goat upon which the lot fell for Jehovah*,

¹ Verse 7.² Edersheim, "Temple," p. 324.³ Verse 7.⁴ "Temple," p. 312.⁵ Verse 5.⁶ Verse 10.

and the goat upon which the lot fell for Azazel. We conclude that both goats represent the Sin-bearer, but that the illustration of a different aspect of His work is allotted to each. One goat bears sins *for Jehovah*, that is, with a view to satisfying His just claims, and is destined to be offered as a sin-offering, its blood being shed and carried into the Divine presence. But¹ the other goat bears sins *for removal*, that is, it is destined to illustrate the removal of those sins for which atonement has been made both from Jehovah's presence and from the habitation of men.

It is important to notice as regards this matter of sin-bearing, that atonement precedes removal. It is not merely that the service of removal is undertaken when the priest has made an end of atoning, although this circumstance is specially emphasized.² But it is provided that atonement shall be made for the live goat before he becomes available for the purpose of removal. The law on this point is as follows:—³

And Aaron shall present the goat upon which the lot fell for Jehovah, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat on which the lot fell for removal, shall be set alive before Jehovah, to make atonement for him, to send him away for removal into the wilderness.

It is clear that the goat which is offered for a sin-offering is regarded as making atonement for the live goat, and that the latter is set alive before Jehovah while the atonement is being made, in preparation for his subsequent work of removal. It is striking that atonement is said to be made for the second goat. We think that it is in connection with the direction to set him *alive* before Jehovah. Both goats have been designated a sin-offering; upon the head of one has already been laid the responsibility for the sins of the congregation, in accordance with the regular ritual of sin-offerings; and on account of their community of interest and identity of reference, that which is laid upon one is also borne by the other. If, then, the second goat is to remain *alive* before Jehovah, atonement must be made for him, for immediate killing before Jehovah is the invariable rule for all victims on which sins have been laid. This goat accordingly, being reserved alive for the subsequent work of removal, is atoned for by the death of its companion. The conception is similar to that which has been noticed in a former chapter,⁴ when speaking of the priesthood. We remember that both priest and sin-offering bore the iniquity of the

¹ The adversative conjunction in verse 10 is to be noticed.

² Verse 20.

³ Verses 9, 10.

⁴ Ch. ix. p. 133.

people, but they divided between them the consequent responsibilities, the victim undertaking the office of blood-shedding and the priest that of mediation. God is said to have given the sin-offerings to the priests to bear iniquity in the matter of atonement by blood-shedding. So here we may say that the first goat was given to the second to do the work of atonement which was the necessary preliminary to the work of removal.

We come now to the ceremony of removal, which is described in the following words:—

And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar, he shall present the live goat. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.

This impressive and unique ceremonial calls for earnest consideration. It may be asked why a second laying on of hands is necessary? We have seen that the laying on of hands upon the goat for a sin-offering had already transferred the responsibility of sin to both goats; and that this responsibility had already been discharged for them both by the death of the one. It is not at once apparent why a second imposition of hands, accompanied by confession, was necessary. Apart from the impressive character of such a rite, we think that the rule may bear reference to what seems to be a truth with regard to the work of Christ. He came, as we know, to be our Substitute and Representative before God, rendering to Him a life-surrender for our sins, and a complete obedience for our acceptance. But this is separable—at least in thought—from the conception of a complete *removal* of sins, by which all the sins of the redeemed people are entirely and finally removed from the sight of God and from themselves. This Christ also offers Himself to do, but He demands from His people, whose atonement and acceptance He has already secured, direct application for this additional gift of grace. He requires us to hand over to Him all our sins, not only for atonement, but also for removal. This is the truth which St. Peter enunciates: *His own self bare our sins in His Body upon the tree, that we being severed from sins* (ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι) *might live unto righteousness.*¹

¹ 1 Pet. II. 24.

It is important to notice that in this ceremonial the sins are represented as carried away both from God and from men. The goat is presented¹ or brought near to God, and sent away from thence. He is also sent outside the camp to the wilderness, where none of the children of Israel are to be found—a solitary land. This supreme work of Christ is begun now and will be consummated hereafter. Every true Christian hopes for the Saviour not only to bear his sins but to bear them away, and the service of the Day of Atonement assures him that the hope is not vain. His iniquities may be sought for, but they will not be found; and we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness without sin.

We have said that the goat on which the lot fell for removal represents Christ as the remover of sin. When he has borne the sins away into a solitary land the work of the goat is completed, and he is *let go into the wilderness*. No other course is possible, owing to the inadequacy of symbols. But care is taken to mark the sanctity of the sin-bearer upon whom falls the lot to illustrate removal, no less than the sanctity of the sin-bearer to whom was allotted the work of atonement. A specially appointed person is prepared to lead the goat on its journey of removal, and when the symbolic removal is complete, and the goat is let go, the man is not at once allowed to mingle with the crowd. He has conducted a most holy thing, and therefore *he that letteth go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp*.²

We have now completed our consideration of the distinctive offerings of the Day of Atonement. They give a complete view of the work of Christ with reference to sins, or perhaps we should say they give as complete a view of that work as has yet been revealed to us in the Gospel.

All that remains is that Aaron should now take up the sacrificial routine of the tabernacle for another year. This he accordingly does; clothed in his vestments he *comes forth and offers his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and makes atonement for himself and for the people*.³ Now also he burns the fat of the sin-offerings by which atonement had before been made, but which had been reserved to this time for

¹ Verse 20.

² Verse 26. How grievously the Synagogue failed to perceive this truth may be seen in Edersheim, "The Temple," pp. 319, 323-4.

³ Verse 24.

burning as a sweet savour, in order to exhibit the blood-shedding acting alone in the work of atonement. It is of particular importance to note that immediately after the comprehensive atonement which had been effected, as soon as Aaron resumes his official position, the first thing which he does is to make atonement for himself and for the people.

We could scarcely have a more striking intimation of the futility of these atonements in themselves. It is written large upon the ritual of the Day of Atonement that the law has only a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things. It can never with its continual repetition of sacrifices really atone, for it is impossible that the blood of bullocks and of goats should take away sins.¹ And yet again, when the special service of the day was over, *one young bullock, one ram, seven he-lambs a year old* for a burnt-offering, with their meal- and drink-offerings, and even *one he-goat* for a sin-offering, were still required.² We shall consider later the whole series of special offerings on festal occasions, but at present we do no more than draw attention to the fact that even the sin-offerings of the Day of Atonement were in themselves unavailing, for *on that very evening* another special sin-offering was offered.

But we would rather close this chapter upon another note than the futility of these multiplied observances. We would rather think of them as true copies of the good things which have come. And we notice with thankfulness and with awe that the first act of the freshly constituted high priest in commencing a new year of service in the tabernacle is *to make atonement*. It is the true message of the Gospel that first of all Christ died for our sins.

¹ Heb. x. 1-4.

² Num. xxix. 7-11.

CHAPTER XV.

THE TRESPASS-OFFERING OR RESTITUTION.

THE chief authorities for our knowledge of the law of trespass-offerings are as follows :—

Lev. v. 14-vi. 7 ; two oracles addressed to Moses on the subject of trespass-offerings.

Lev. vii. 1-7 ; part of an oracle addressed through Moses to Aaron and his sons.

Lev. xxii. 14-16 ; part of another oracle addressed through Moses to Aaron and his sons.

Num. v. 5-8 ; addressed through Moses to the children of Israel.

THE NAME.

The Hebrew word for trespass-offering is *asham*. This word occurs for the first time in Scripture in Gen. xxvi. 10 where Abimelech, in his remonstrance with Isaac, says that through Isaac's want of straightforwardness one of the Philistines might easily have violated his wife, and so Isaac would have brought *guiltiness* upon the Philistines. The cognate adjective occurs in Gen. xlii. 21. Joseph's brethren in Egypt say to one another, "We are verily *guilty* concerning our brother, in that we saw the distress of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear ; therefore is this distress come upon us". It is evident that the idea in these two instances is that of "penalty" incurred through wrong-doing. It is assumed that every wrongful act exposes the wrong-doer to penal consequences, which he must pay. The English word *guilt*, which is derived from the Anglo-Saxon *geldan*, to pay a fine, will therefore best represent the meaning of *asham* in these two instances. It is important to notice that the Philistine ruler recognizes that guilt will be incurred, whether the act of wrong-doing be deliberate or unwitting. He may have been aware of the history of the Abimelech of Abraham's time, who took Sarah into his house on a misunderstanding

with a view to marrying her. While God fully acknowledged the plea of ignorance on behalf of the nation which Abimelech represented, His testimony to Abimelech himself was unequivocal, "Thou art but a dead man, because of the woman whom thou hast taken; for she is a man's wife" (Gen. xx. 3). It is clear then that an act of wrong-doing, whether deliberate or unintentional, is regarded as rendering the wrong-doer liable to penal consequences, which must be paid. The next occurrence of the word *asham* in Scripture is in connection with the new institution of sin-offerings. This is what we might expect, as it is part of the purpose of those offerings to exhibit the consequences of sin; it is natural then to emphasize the fact that every sin, even those which are committed unwittingly, brings consequences in its train. In the law of sin-offerings we find the word in the following connections:—

"If the anointed priest shall sin *so as to bring guilt* on the people, then let him offer . . ."

"If the whole congregation err . . . and *are guilty* . . ."

"When a ruler sinneth . . . and *is guilty* . . ."

"If any one of the common people sin unwittingly . . . and *be guilty* . . ."

"If anyone touch any unclean thing . . . and it be hidden from him . . . then *he shall be guilty* . . ."

"Or if he touch the uncleanness of man . . . and it be hid from him . . . *he shall be guilty* . . ."

"Or if anyone swear rashly . . . and it be hid from him . . . *he shall be guilty*."

"*When he shall be guilty* in one of these things he shall bring his *guilt-offering* unto Jehovah for his sin which he hath sinned, a lamb or a goat for a sin-offering . . ."

"And if his means suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring his *guilt-offering* for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering" (Lev. IV.-V. 13).

✓ It is evident that the *guilt* of sin is intended to be emphasized by the law of sin-offerings. The special consequence of sin that is in view in the sin-offerings is, however, the incurred liability to *death*. We have seen how the ritual with shed blood dominates the whole, in exact accordance with the constant testimony of Scripture that the soul that sinneth it shall *die*. The surrender of life by the substitute and representative of a man who has incurred guilt by sin pays his debt, and frees him from further indebtedness in respect of his liability to die.

This word is next given as a name to a new variety of offerings, henceforward to be known technically as *asham*. The sin-offering had indeed also been termed *asham*, inasmuch as it showed the liability of the sinner to death, and the manner in which that liability was removed from the sinner to his substitute; but it was the purpose of God to emphasize still further the aspect of sin as involving the sinner in the payment of a debt. This He did by the law of *guilt-offerings*, which is the subject of the present chapter. The Septuagint translators usually render *asham* by *πλημμέλεια*, a mistake, like a false note in music; but this rendering seems inadequate in the face of the passages which have been quoted.

We have seen that the word *asham* appears to denote the liabilities incurred by the sinner, and we shall accordingly translate the word, when applied to offerings, as *guilt-offering*.

The law of guilt-offerings was given in two short oracles immediately after the law of sin-offerings. The first oracle deals with offences against Jehovah;¹ the second oracle with offences against one's neighbour.² It is striking that the latter, no less than the former, are regarded as *a trespass against Jehovah*,³ that is a breach of the trust committed to men by Jehovah.

We notice in the first place that the guilt-offering, like the sin-offering, is a new institution. There is no mention of such an offering before the time which we are considering, and the manner in which it is now introduced agrees with this fact. We remember that the law for burnt-offerings and for peace-offerings assumed that they were already being offered by the Israelites, and only regulated the manner in which they were to be offered in future. The law of sin-offerings on the other hand was introduced with the words, "If anyone shall sin unwittingly, then he shall offer a sin-offering," and in the same way we read in the present case, "If anyone commit a trespass . . . then he shall bring his guilt-offering". It is evident that here also a new institution is being promulgated, as in the case of the sin-offerings.

It is natural to enquire whether guilt-offerings were simply an alternative form to the regular sin-offering as an offering for sin, or whether they were provided for different cases

¹ Lev. v. 14-19.

² *Ib.* vi. 1-7.

³ *Ib.* 2. "Trespass" here is *ma'al* not *asham*.

of wrong-doing. It is not easy, we think, to give a decided answer to this question. On the one hand there seems to be an indication that a particular kind of transgression, designated *trespass*, is in view, and on the other hand, it seems as if a guilt-offering was also allowed in certain cases where we might have expected a sin-offering to be prescribed. We shall consider these two points in detail, and then offer a suggested explanation.

First we may say that the normal occasion for offering a guilt-offering was when a wrong act, technically known as a *trespass*, had been committed. We read in the first oracle dealing with this subject, *If anyone commit a trespass, and sin unwittingly in the holy things of Jehovah; then he shall bring his guilt-offering unto Jehovah.*¹ And similarly in the second oracle we read, *If anyone sin, and commit a trespass against Jehovah, and deal falsely with his neighbour in a matter of deposit, or of bargain, or of robbery, or have oppressed his neighbour, or have found that which was lost, and deal falsely therein, and swear to a lie; in any of all these things that a man doeth, sinning therein, then it shall be, if he hath sinned and is guilty . . . he shall bring his guilt-offering unto Jehovah.*² It is important then to enquire what is intended by a *trespass*. The word in the original is *ma'al*, which occurs here in Scripture for the first time, and denotes faithlessness or treachery. "It represents wrong-doing as a breach of trust, whether between man and man or between man and God."³ In the present case it points to unfaithfulness by failure to separate the holy things of Jehovah to His use; or to treacherous dealings with one's neighbour. It is interesting to note the special sins to which this technical word is afterwards applied in Scripture, no doubt with an implied reference to the law of the guilt-offering. Thus the sin of Moses and Aaron at Meribah is called a *trespass*, because they did not give God the glory which was His due.⁴ So also the sin of Achan, who took possession for his own use of things devoted to Jehovah, is constantly referred to as a *trespass*.⁵ The altar which the two and a half tribes built on the east of Jordan seemed also to be a treacherous act of disloyalty to the institutions of the tabernacle, and is therefore properly called a *trespass*.⁶ So also we read that *Saul died for his trespass which he committed against Jehovah, because of the word of Jehovah which he kept not,*⁷ the

¹ Lev. v. 15.

² *Ib.* vi. 2-6.

³ "O.T. Synonyms," *sub voc.*

⁴ Deut. xxxii. 51.

⁵ E.g. Josh. vii. 1.

⁶ Josh. xxii. 16.

⁷ 1 Chron. x. 13.

reference being no doubt to his appropriation of the devoted things on the occasion of his mission against Amalek. The intrusion of Uzziah into the priestly office was a trespass,¹ no less than the idolatry of Ahaz, who turned his back upon the claims of Jehovah.² The foreign marriages which the people and the priests contracted on their return from exile, *not separating themselves from the people of the lands*, constituted a trespass.³ In all these connections we can trace the technical sense of unfaithfulness in the things of Jehovah, which appears to be affixed to the word by the law of guilt-offerings. As regards its reference to unfaithfulness or treachery as between man and man, we are also not without instances, although the sense is sufficiently indicated by the examples given in the law itself. The wrong-doing which is contemplated is evidently cheating and dishonesty of every kind, whereby a neighbour is deprived of his just due. It is in accordance with this that a wife who is unfaithful to her husband is said to commit a trespass against him;⁴ and that Solomon declares that *a king's mouth shall not transgress* (or "trespass") *in judgment*,⁵ the meaning in this latter case being that a king in pronouncing judgment between litigants will not deprive either of the justice which is his due. It appears then that guilt-offerings were not merely an alternative form of offering for sin, as if it were left to the sinner's own choice whether he brought his offering as a sin-offering or as a guilt-offering, but that they were prescribed for wrong actions of a particular kind. The kind of wrong-doing which is specially in view, moreover, is that by which some person is deprived of his due rights.

On the other hand, it is certainly significant that guilt-offerings are not restricted to that class of sins which would be technically described as a trespass. They are also provided in a case which seems indistinguishable from cases which we have seen to call for a sin-offering. We read *if anyone sin, and do any of the things which Jehovah hath commanded not to be done, though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity. And he shall bring a ram . . . for a guilt-offering*.⁶ Here there is no mention of a trespass; and the occasion seems to be in all essentials identical with that which is contemplated in the law of sin-offerings, of which we read generally that they are to be offered *if anyone shall sin*

¹ 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 18.

³ Ezra ix. 1, 2; Neh. xiii. 27.

⁵ Prov. xvi. 10.

² *Ib.* xxviii. 19; xxix. 6, 7.

⁴ Num. v. 12, 27.

⁶ Lev. v. 17, 18.

*unwittingly, in any of the things which Jehovah hath commanded not to be done, and shall do any one of them.*¹

This, which seems at first sight to be an inconsistency, may, we think, suggest to us the true intention and meaning of the institution of guilt-offerings. We have seen that the sin-offerings were designed to stimulate the conscience of the Israelites, and to call their attention to the true nature and effect of sin. In the double series of sin-offerings, sin was laid bare as a violation of the Divine order, and a profanation of the Divine Name. It was shown that sin being of this nature rendered the sinner in all cases liable to death. But sin may be viewed in another aspect. It is emphatically a breach of trust, a denial to God of that which is His due. It is the constant testimony of Scripture that men are created for God, and that the obeying of His commands, and the carrying out of His purposes, is the final cause of their being. It is true, as we have seen, that they are part of the Divine creation, and that the law of that creation is the law of their existence. It is also certain that they are created in His likeness, and to display certain of His attributes, and that their lack of correspondence with that ideal is a profanation of His Name. It remains, however, to represent sin in its aspect of injustice, if we may so speak, by which the Creator is deprived of that which is His due. If this conception of sin is realized, it will be seen at once that sin calls aloud for *restitution*. We believe then that the purpose of God in instituting guilt-offerings was to illustrate and confirm that *additional* truth with regard to the sins of men. It was to be shown that wrong-doing not only rendered men liable to death, but also demanded from them restitution of that which had been wrongfully withheld. For this purpose God in His wisdom selected certain kinds of wrong-doing which most clearly exhibited this characteristic of sin as the withholding of just dues, and instituted a special type of offering for their atonement, regulating the ritual of these offerings meanwhile in such a way as to keep clearly in view the idea of restitution, and throw the whole emphasis upon this aspect of the matter. But if these offerings had been *restricted* to clear cases of trespass, the conclusion might have been missed that *all* sins are essentially in the nature of a trespass. Accordingly we find that those sins which render a man liable to the penalty of death are shown to lay him also under the obligation of making restitution, even though on the face of it they do not bear this character.

¹ Lev. iv. 2.

It is then on account of this leading principle that the name *guilt* is attached to these offerings. Sin in its aspect of missing the end of our existence necessarily leads to death, and that offering for sin which emphasizes this fact is known by the word which expresses the idea of missing the mark.¹ Sin in its aspect of a failure to fulfil obligations creates a liability for restitution, and to the offering for sin which emphasizes this fact that word which peculiarly expresses obligation and liability² is attached as a name.

Comparing the law of guilt-offerings with the law of sin-offerings, we notice that here also in two cases the sin is assumed to be unwittingly committed ;³ and in the case where a trespass against one's neighbour is in view, although it cannot be said to be done in ignorance, we feel that the sudden overmastering force of the love of gain is recognized, not as excusing the fault, but as temporarily blinding the eyes, or silencing the conscience, just as in the case of some sin-offerings the force of fear or passion is taken into consideration. In either case, when conscience awakes, it is to be listened to and the fault acknowledged or reparation made, and atonement is to be sought for.

We conclude, generally, with regard to the guilt-offerings, that they were intended to deepen the recognition of sin as something which calls for restitution and reparation.

We notice then first of all that whenever a man had committed a trespass either in the things which were recognized as specially consecrated to God, or in things which properly belonged to his neighbour, he was called upon in each case to make reparation with interest. As regards *the holy things of Jehovah*, these are no doubt the first-born of men, the firstlings of cattle, the first-fruits of the ground, and the tithes.⁴ All these must either be redeemed with money, or be given to the priests. To these holy things must also be added all devoted things, as fully described in the last chapter of Leviticus. Whenever an Israelite either through carelessness or forgetfulness took a holy thing for his own use,⁵ he was bound, as soon as he recognized what he had done, both to confess his fault⁶ and to make restitution for it. And in the same way where he recognized that he had obtained anything fraudulently from a neighbour he was to make both confession and restitution. In the case of a trespass in the holy things of Jehovah, *he shall make restitution for that which he hath done amiss in the holy thing, and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the*

¹ *Chattath*.² Num. XVIII.³ *Asham*.⁴ Lev. XXII. 14-16.⁵ Lev. v. 15, 17, 18.⁶ Num. v. 7.

*priest.*¹ In the case of a trespass against his neighbour, *he shall even restore it in full, and shall add the fifth part more thereto ; unto him to whom it appertaineth shall he give it in the day of his being found guilty.*² There could scarcely be a clearer testimony to the fact that sin viewed as a trespass calls aloud for restitution. In the Book of Numbers the law on this matter is put with equal clearness and emphasis: *When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, so as to trespass against Jehovah, and that soul shall be guilty ; then he shall confess his sin which he hath done ; and he shall make restitution for his guilt in full, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him in respect of whom he hath been guilty. But if the man have no kinsman to whom restitution may be made for the guilt, the restitution for guilt which is made unto Jehovah shall be the priest's.*³ We may remark that the addition of a fifth part to the original debt is no doubt by way of fatherly correction for a fault committed, and was intended to act as a deterrent. We find the same proportion fixed when a man desired to buy back for his own use an unclean animal, or a house or field which he had vowed, or a portion of his tithe,⁴ the object in that case evidently being to deter the people from the practice of making vows without due consideration.

But it is very important to observe that while this essential characteristic of sin as a trespass calling for due reparation is in this way brought home to the Israelite mind and conscience, God at the same time seizes the opportunity to show that He has provided for this emergency also, and that the representative and substitute for men which He points out undertakes for them the whole responsibility incurred by sin, including this debt of reparation. He has shown by the law of the sin-offerings that the penalty of death due from men will be borne by Another ; He is about to show by the law of the guilt-offerings that the claim for restitution will also be fully met by that same Person.

This brings us to consider the ritual of the guilt-offering: *He shall bring his guilt-offering unto Jehovah, a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation in silver by shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, for a guilt-offering.*⁵ It is a peculiarity of the guilt-offering that the animal is in all cases to be the same, namely, a ram.⁶ This rule seems to have been strictly observed. The guilt-offering in the case of

¹ Lev. v. 16.⁴ Lev. xxvii. 13, 15, 19, 27, 31.² *Ib.* vi. 5.⁵ *Ib.* v. 15.³ Num. v. 6-8.⁶ *Ib.* 18 ; vi. 6.

the cleansing of a leper,¹ or on the renewal after accidental breaking of a Nazarite vow,² was in each case to be a he-lamb. A ram was appointed as a guilt-offering for a man who had violated a bondwoman who was betrothed.³ In strict accordance with this the priests who had married foreign wives, when they gave their hands that they would put away their wives, offered a ram of the flock for their guilt.⁴ A ram seems indeed to have been associated with guilt-offerings in some such way as he-goats were associated with sin-offerings, only in this case the rule admitted of no variation whatever. It does not seem that there is any special significance in this fact, unless indeed it is connected with the general idea of standardization which attaches to this offering. The rule for the guilt-offering appears to attach great importance to the offering being of standard value, according to the estimation of the priest, in the currency of the temple. We find in all three cases of the law of guilt-offerings that the ram is to be "according to the estimation" of the priest. It is a striking comment on the significance of this phrase that it is used elsewhere in connection with estimating what was Jehovah's due in all cases where that due was to be met by a money payment.⁵ In the present case then we must regard the regulation as intimating that the offering is examined by the representative of Jehovah, and passed by him as satisfying the Divine claims. Restitution has to be made for sin regarded as a trespass, and Jehovah decides that according to His own standards the restitution is satisfactory and complete. This then is the lesson of the guilt-offering. The sinner brings it, *and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the guilt-offering, and he shall be forgiven.*⁶ It is very interesting, and also important, to observe that the atonement results in being *forgiven concerning whatsoever he doeth so as to be guilty thereby*;⁷ clearly showing that the ram of the guilt-offering frees the man from all further liability to make restitution. It is also made very clear that the result follows not from the restitution made by the man himself, but from the offering of the ram on his behalf. This is shown for one thing by the fact that in the second case, where a guilt-offering is prescribed for a sin other than technical trespass, and where the man himself makes no restitution, the result is the same, *he shall be forgiven.*⁸ It is also definitely asserted in the first case that while the man is to

¹ Lev. XIV. 12.² Num. VI. 12.³ Lev. XIX. 21.⁴ Ezra X. 19.⁵ Lev. XXVII. *passim*, and Num. XVIII. 16.⁶ *Ib.* v. 16.⁷ *Ib.* VI. 7.⁸ *Ib.* v. 18.

make restitution and give it to the priest, the priest shall make atonement for him *with the ram of the guilt-offering*,¹ and so he shall be forgiven. Finally, where restitution is made for trespass upon a neighbour's right or property, the restitution is first made to the person affected, and then the guilt-offering is brought to the priest, and the priest makes atonement.² We conclude that the guilt-offerings like the sin-offerings serve a double purpose. They are adapted to arouse and to strengthen the voice of conscience and to deepen the sense of indebtedness on account of wrong-doing, this on the one hand. On the other hand, they are designed to show that this indebtedness cannot be discharged by men except in the appointed way and by the mediation and satisfaction of another.

As regards the actual ritual to be followed in guilt-offerings enough is mentioned to show that it is connected in all essentials with the other three substitutionary offerings. We are told that *in the place where they kill the burnt-offering shall they kill the guilt-offering*.³ This implies that the guilt-offering was killed to the north of the altar and with the rites which accompanied the burnt-offering. As to the ritual of the blood, we read that *the blood thereof [the priest] shall sprinkle upon the altar round about*.⁴ This shows that the ritual of the blood was not the special ritual of the sin-offerings, but followed that of the lesser burnt-offerings, and of the peace-offerings. This is no doubt because in the guilt-offerings as in those other offerings the emphasis does not lie on the penalty of death borne by the victim, but upon the satisfactory restitution effected by it. The burning of the fat follows the ritual of the peace-offerings and sin-offerings. *He shall offer of it all the fat thereof; the fat tail, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys, shall he take away, and the priest shall burn them upon the altar for an offering made by fire unto Jehovah; it is a guilt-offering*.⁵ The addition of the words "it is a guilt-offering" at the end of the directions for burning the fat is remarkable. No such addition occurs at the end of the corresponding direction for sin-offerings, but a similar addition is made in the case of the peace-offerings, where it is said that the fat is the food of the offering.⁶ We are inclined to think that in the present case there is a reminder by this addition of the essential idea of the offering in

¹ Lev. v. 16 : cf. Num. v. 8.

² *Ib.* vii. 2.

³ *Ib.* verses 3-5.

⁴ Lev. vi. 5-7.

⁵ *Ib.*

⁶ *Ib.* iv. 10 ; iii. 11, 16.

question. In the peace-offerings the ruling idea is of fellowship with God, and the sweet savour of the burnt-offering of fat is connected with this idea, by being described as the share of God in the communion enjoyed. In the guilt-offerings, on the other hand, the sweet savour of the burnt-offering is described as a guilt-offering, because it involves the essential idea of guilt-offerings, which is a full and complete satisfaction by way of restitution and reparation for men in all their failures in duty.¹ Finally we find a regulation for the disposal of the remainder of the carcass exactly similar to the regulation for those sin-offerings whose blood was not taken into the holy place. *Every male among the priests shall eat thereof; it shall be eaten in a holy place; it is most holy. As is the sin-offering, so is the guilt-offering; there is one law for them; the priest that maketh atonement therewith, he shall have it.*²

We have now passed in rapid review the points connected with the ritual of the guilt-offerings and have found a complete correspondence with the three preceding forms of offering, establishing without doubt the fact of a common reference in them all. The significance which every point of ritual bears in the others it bears also in the guilt-offerings, but as we have already discussed these fully we will not repeat ourselves here.

We rejoice to know, on the authority of Jehovah Himself, that the Lord Jesus Christ has made for us a full and complete satisfaction, so that, if we may with reverence use such language, God has suffered no loss on account of our individual sins. We cannot understand it, but if we read the teaching of the guilt-offering aright, it not only calls us to make instant and full reparation so far as we can for every trespass which we recognize in ourselves against God or against man. It does more than this; it assures us that there is One Who has fulfilled in His person the whole duty of man, and for whose sake God is satisfied with us, for Jehovah has made Him to be a guilt-offering.³

¹ The appointment of a *male* animal for this offering, as in the case of the burnt-offerings, may be partly on account of this connection between the two forms of offering.

² Lev. VII. verses 6, 7.

³ Is. LIII. 10.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE MEAL-OFFERINGS AND DRINK-OFFERINGS, OR HUMAN SERVICE.

THE chief authorities for the law of meal- and drink-offerings are as follows :—

- Lev. II. : part of an oracle addressed through Moses to the children of Israel, and containing the law of the meal-offering.
- Lev. VI. 14-23 : part of an oracle addressed through Moses to Aaron and his sons, concerning the law of the meal-offering as it affected the priests.
- Lev. VII. 9, 10 : part of a similar oracle defining the priest's portion in meal-offerings : comp. Lev. X. 12, 13.
- Num. XV. 1-16 : an oracle addressed through Moses to the children of Israel concerning the meal- and drink-offerings which accompanied burnt-offerings and sacrifices.

THE NAME.

The Hebrew word for meal-offering is *Minchah*, and for drink-offering is *Nesec*. *Minchah* is simply a "gift" or "present," and is used in Genesis for the present which Jacob prepared for Esau, and also for that which his sons carried down into Egypt for Joseph (Gen. XXXII. and XLIII. *passim*). But it is also used in the earliest chapters of Genesis for a gift brought to God. We read that "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an *offering* unto Jehovah. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Jehovah had respect unto Abel and to his *offering*; but unto Cain and to his *offering* He had not respect" (Gen. IV. 4, 5). The word "offering" in these verses represents *minchah* in the original. It appears therefore that the word was originally applied to an offering made to God, whether

it consisted of animals or of vegetable produce. We do not, however, meet with the word in Scripture again, in the sense of an offering to God, until the time of the exodus, and then it appears to be restricted to other than animal offerings. These latter by that time had acquired the names of "burnt-offerings" and "sacrifices," while *minchah* had become appropriated to the designation of offerings of another kind, and indeed specially to offerings of meal. Thus we find that in the summary directions for the tabernacle service the *minchah* of flour is spoken of as a well-known institution (Exod. XXIX. 40, 41). So also, after the completion of the tabernacle, when detailed instructions concerning offerings are given, the *minchah* appears as a separate entity alongside of burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and is found not to be an animal-offering (Lev. II.). On the whole then we conclude that the word *minchah* originally indicated any kind of offering to God, but that at the time of Moses it was not applied to animal offerings. The Law of Offerings finally affixed to the word a technical sense as indicating an offering of meal prepared in various ways. From this time forwards the word *minchah*, when applied to offerings, is found in Scripture only in this technical sense, and is never inclusive of those substitutionary offerings which we have hitherto considered. We are convinced that this early restriction to one form of offering of a term which is in a true sense applicable to all the offerings, and the stereotyping of this restricted sense in the Law of Offerings, is not without Divine direction.

The animal-offerings no less than the meal-offerings were given to God, inasmuch as they were voluntarily surrendered by man to His service. But when we consider the true significance of the animal-offerings, we realize that there is a reason for their not being called "a gift". In the deepest sense, as we have seen in our study of those offerings, they are the gift of God to man, rather than a gift of man to God. But the meal-offering we shall see in the present chapter to represent the outcome of human labour. God is pleased to accept this when consecrated to His service as a gift from men, and to this offering then the term *minchah* is appropriated. We have remarked that the appropriation of the name to this kind of offering was earlier than the time of Moses. It may conceivably have been by an unrecorded revelation to Abraham, or to an earlier man of God, but on this question it is unprofitable to speculate. The important thing is to notice that this distinctive reference of the word *minchah* gains

Divine authority by being adopted in the Law of Offerings. Meanwhile in other connections the word retained its original meaning of a gift or present.¹

With regard to drink-offerings, the first mention of these in Holy Scripture is in the history of Jacob. After his return from Haran, and the appearance of God to him at Bethel, "he set up a pillar in the place where [God] spake with him, a pillar of stone; and he poured out a drink-offering thereon, and poured oil thereon" (Gen. XXXV. 14). The verb *nasac*, from which *nesec* is derived, denotes "to pour out,"² so that "libation" seems to be a more accurate rendering than "drink-offering". From the manner in which drink-offerings are introduced in the summary directions for the tabernacle service (Exod. XXIX. 41), we conclude that they were well known at the time of Moses. Probably *minchah* and *nesec* had long been associated as gifts of meat and drink, hence the terms "meat-offering" and "drink-offering" with which we are familiar in the Authorized Version. The Revisers have however adopted the term "meal-offering" for *minchah*, probably with reference to the distinguishing constituent of the offering, and to guard against any misconception of the word "meat," as if it referred to flesh. In the offering of Jacob referred to above there is no mention of *minchah* along with his *nesec*, and so far as it goes this is an indication that the two were not always offered together. However this may be, we believe that in the Mosaic Law of Offerings they were always combined, and in this chapter they will be considered together.

The Septuagint translators "have *θυσία* (sacrifice) for *minchah* in 140 places, and *δῶρον* (a gift) in 32 places".³ For *nesec* they always have *σπονδή* (a libation).

We come now in our study to the meal- and drink-offerings, and we are at once struck with the fact that we are dealing with an institution which presents a complete contrast to the four offerings which we have so far considered. We recall what was said in a former chapter about the burnt-offerings, the sacrifices of peace-offerings, the sin- and the trespass-offerings, namely, that they presented many features

¹ E.g. Judges III. 15; 1 Kings x. 25; 2 Kings VIII. 8; Hos. x. 6.

² Hence to cast metal (Is. XL. 19), and figuratively to set or to constitute (Ps. II. 6; Prov. VIII. 23). Similarly *nesec* sometimes denotes a molten image (e.g. Jer. x. 14).

³ "O.T. Synonyms," *sub voc.*

in common. One such common feature was in the substance of the offering, each being taken from the flock or the herd, or in some cases from doves and pigeons. The meal-offering on the other hand admits no oblation of bird or animal. Another feature common to the ritual of those four offerings is the surrender of life by the victim; and this of course is totally absent in the meal-offering. We did indeed find that in one case the idea of life-surrender was faintly imaged by the offering of one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour. And we find that the meal-offering which accompanied a lamb, whether offered for a burnt-offering or for a sacrifice of peace-offerings, was in each case one-tenth of an ephah. But it is quite clear that this meal-offering is in no sense significant of life-surrender, not only because of the presence with it of oil and frankincense, and of the wine of the drink-offering, which we shall soon see to be significant of the activities and not of the support of life; but much more because in the case of a ram the meal-offering consisted of two-tenths of flour, and in the case of a bullock of three-tenths,¹ showing that no significance is to be attached to the amount of flour used. And indeed in the law of the meal-offering this point is not even referred to.² Once more we observed that those four offerings were offered for atonement and acceptance, and were accompanied by the laying on of the hands of the offerer, an intention and a ritual of which we can find no trace in the law of meal-offerings. This contrast between the meal-offering and the other four offerings will become still more marked as we proceed to examine its ritual in detail. We draw attention to it at the outset as an indication that the meal-offering is intentionally differentiated from the other four. We have seen that those four are "made like the Son of God". We conclude then that the meal-offering is "made like" something else.

Turning then to the law of meal-offerings, we notice first that it occurs in the course of the first oracle which deals with these subjects, and occupies the second place in that oracle, following the law of burnt-offerings, and preceding the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. The method of introduction, *When anyone offereth an oblation of a meal-offering unto Jehovah, his oblation shall be of fine flour*, suggests also that meal-offerings like burnt- and peace-offerings were an already existing institution. All this we have had occasion to remark before. The position of the law of meal-offerings after

¹ Num. xv.² Lev. ii.

the law of burnt-offerings may be reminiscent of the history of the two institutions. We have seen reason to believe that the offering of animals as burnt-offerings is a rite as old as the race, and is indeed the original form of sacrificial worship. Offerings of vegetable produce are found as early as the time of Cain and Abel,¹ but in the patriarchal family there is no hint of the practice until the return of Jacob from Haran. God appears to him at that time at Bethel, and Jacob sets up a pillar of stone,² and consecrates it with oil, as he had done on a former occasion.³ But now he pours out also a drink-offering on the stone, which he had not done before. It does not seem reasonable to base too much upon the silence of Scripture as to any offering upon the stone which Jacob set up at Bethel on his flight to Haran, because he may not have been in a position to make such an offering at that time. But it does seem significant that from the time of Cain until the time when Jacob returned from his exile, while there is mention of burnt-offerings and of altar building, there is no mention whatever of a meal- or drink-offering.

On the whole we are inclined to think that the offering of Cain was unwarranted and was indicative of his character. The obedience of faith was shown in Abel's offering, as the inspired writer has assured us; and equally so his habitual unbelief was shown by the offering of Cain. If this is so, we arrive at the conclusion that the animal burnt-offering was the only original form of sacrifice, but that drink-offerings, and probably meal-offerings also, date in the patriarchal family from the time of Jacob's long exile in Haran, when also, it will be remembered, we first find notice of a sacrificial meal. If this is so it would account for the position of the meal-offering after the burnt-offering in the law of offerings. But we believe also that there may have been at the time some connection between these two. It is true that we have no direct evidence of this in the Book of Genesis, for, setting aside the case of Cain as irrelevant, there is no mention at all of a meal-offering, and in the single case where the drink-offering is mentioned it stands alone. But in the summary regulations for the tabernacle service it is directed that two lambs should be offered upon the altar day by day continually, one in the morning and one in the evening, and *with the one lamb* a tenth part of an ephah of flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil, and the fourth part of a hin of wine for a drink-offering. *And the other lamb shalt*

¹ Gen. iv. 3.² *Ib.* xxxv. 14.³ *Ib.* xxviii. 18.

*thou offer at even, and shalt do thereto according to the meal-offering of the morning and according to the drink-offering thereof.*¹

The phraseology at least suggests an existing custom of attaching meal- and drink-offerings to animal sacrifices. But the point is not of great importance, and we do not press it. Whatever may have been the custom before the time of Moses, it seems clear that the ideal of the law is that to every burnt-offering and every sacrifice of peace-offerings its appropriate meal- and drink-offering should be always attached; and further, that these should never be offered except in connection with a burnt-offering or a sacrifice of peace-offerings. This connection is not hinted at in the law of meal-offerings which we are considering,² nor is the drink-offering mentioned in this passage, but the law for meal-offerings does follow immediately upon the law for burnt-offerings, which is at least agreeable to the supposition of a recognized connection between them. And there is one passage in Leviticus where meal- and drink-offerings are mentioned together and are definitely connected with burnt-offerings. In the twenty-third chapter the regulations for the set feasts of Jehovah are made known to Moses. In connection with the barley harvest a he-lamb is to be offered for a burnt-offering, and we read that *the meal-offering thereof shall be two tenth parts of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil . . . and the drink-offering thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of a hin.*³ The same form of expression is used in connection with the animal burnt-offerings at the feast of Pentecost, *they shall be a burnt-offering unto Jehovah, with their meal-offering and their drink-offerings.*⁴ It is interesting, however, to notice that these regulations anticipate the entry of the people into the promised land. It is quite possible that during the sojourn in the wilderness animal sacrifices were sometimes offered without "their meal-offering and their drink-offerings," but very probably the existing custom, and quite certainly the ideal rule was otherwise.

In the fifteenth chapter of Numbers the command is precise: *When ye are come into the land of your habitations . . . and will make an offering by fire unto Jehovah, a burnt-offering or a sacrifice [sc. of peace-offerings] . . . to make a sweet savour unto Jehovah . . . then shall he that offereth his oblation offer unto Jehovah a meal-offering . . . and wine for the drink-offer-*

¹ Exod. xxix. 40, 41.

² Lev. II.

³ Ib. xxiii. 13.

⁴ Ib. 18.

✓ *ing.*¹ It is evident then that meal- and drink-offerings must always accompany burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, the fat of the latter being, as we have seen, a true burnt-offering. But if these offerings were always to accompany burnt- and peace-offerings, it seems equally clear that they were never to be offered in any other way. There is indeed no definite statement to this effect, but the implication in the words *the meal-offering thereof and the drink-offering thereof* as applied to the burnt-offerings is very clear, and there seems to be no instance after the time of Moses of a meal-or drink-offering being offered apart from the animal burnt-offering. There are indeed two apparent exceptions which deserve consideration in this connection. The first is the daily oblation of Aaron and of his sons, consisting of the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, baked with oil on a baking pan, and presented half in the morning and half in the evening of each day. This was the perpetual meal-offering of the priests,² and appears to have been offered without a drink-offering and apart from any animal sacrifice. If indeed no drink-offering was attached to this offering, it shows that meal- and drink-offerings were not so united as never to be separable. We think, however, that a drink-offering may, as elsewhere also, be understood, although unexpressed. And as regards the absence of any animal sacrifice, we believe the explanation to be that the meal-offering of the priesthood, to be offered perpetually from "the day in which Aaron is anointed,"³ is symbolic of the human activities of the Anointed Mediator. These rise to God by their own intrinsic merit, and not upon the fires of a substitutionary burnt-offering.

✓ The second case is that of *the new meal-offering*⁴ of two loaves baked with leaven. These were offered at Pentecost, the feast of first-fruits, and are spoken of as being *for first-fruits to Jehovah*. On this account they are called "a new meal-offering," to show that the offering is not the ordinary meal-offering with which no leaven might be mingled,⁵ but an offering of first-fruits. At the same time the term meal-offering is applied to them, and perhaps for this reason it is commanded that several animals are to be presented *with the bread* as a burnt-offering. It is evident, however, that we are dealing here with an exceptional case, and its consideration need not detain us longer in this place.

¹ Num. xv. 1-5.² Lev. vi. 19-23.³ *Ib.* vi. 20.⁴ *Ib.* xxiii. 16; Num. xxviii. 26.⁵ Lev. ii. 11, 12.

We gather on the whole that the place of meal- and drink-offerings in the Divine scheme is in connection with animal burnt-offerings, with which they are constantly associated, and apart from which they are not offered. The full significance of this fact will appear when we have satisfied ourselves of that to which the meal- and drink-offerings are made like. The result so far is confirmatory of the conclusion at which we have already arrived, that they are *not* made like the Son of God. If they had been intended to present a likeness to Him, they would no doubt have been attached to all the four animal offerings, or else separated from them all. On the contrary, we find that they never stand alone, and are constantly attached to two only of the four.

The real significance of the meal- and drink-offerings must then be sought in their constituents and in their ritual. To this accordingly we now turn our attention. As regards the meal-offering we read, *His oblation shall be of fine flour, and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon.*¹ Certain variations in preparation of the offering are sanctioned. These may be summarized as follows:—

(1) if baked in the oven, unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil:

(2) if prepared in a baking-pan, of fine flour unleavened, and mingled with oil; parted in pieces, and oil poured upon them:

(3) if fried in the frying-pan, of fine flour with oil.

These are the recognized forms of the meal-offering. We gather that the constituents which are common to every form are two only, namely, meal and oil.² The drink-offering is always of wine, so that combining the two offerings we have the three staples of Israelite diet, grain and oil and wine.³ It is interesting to note the collocation of these three in more than one passage of Scripture, as summarizing the produce of the land,⁴ and the result of man's labour. At once the significance of this offering flashes upon us. The earliest record of the appointed labour of man is that *Jehovah God took the man and put him into the Garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it*,⁵ the later prediction of the life of fallen man is that *in*

¹ Lev. II. 1.

² And so even in a meal-offering of first-fruits the oil was added (ver. 15).

³ There is an interesting reference to the use of oil and wine in the service of God in the parable of Jotham (Judges IX. 9, 13).

⁴ E.g. Ps. CIV. 15; Hos. II. 22; Joel II. 19; Neh. X. 39.

⁵ Gen. II. 15.

*toil shalt thou eat of the ground all the days of thy life.*¹ So too the Preacher tells us that *the king himself is served by the field,*² and that in the end *all the labour of man is for his mouth.*³ These gifts then brought near to God represent the sum of human activities ; they are a symbol of human service. We believe that our further investigation into the law of the meal- and drink-offerings will show that the whole ritual is accounted for, and becomes a striking picture of eternal truths, if this supposition is granted.

For example, we are at once supplied with an explanation of the fact that meal- and drink-offerings are attached to burnt-offerings, and not to others ; the reason being that the burnt-offering represents the acceptable service of the Representative and Substitute of men, while the meal- and drink-offerings represent the personal service of those whom He represents. The picture then is exactly true to the Gospel declaration that *our Saviour Jesus Christ gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works.*⁴ He sanctified Himself so that we might be sanctified ; and we are called to walk even as He walked, if we depend upon Him for atonement and for acceptance. But it may be urged that the fire-offering of sweet savour is not confined to the burnt-offering and to the sacrifice of peace-offerings ; it is equally present in the sin- and trespass-offerings, and therefore the meal- and drink-offerings would rightly accompany them also. To this we may reply that it is more true to eternal verities entirely to exclude the symbol of human service rendered to God from those offerings which are specially concerned with atonement and with restitution for sin. This is a part of the work of our Substitute and Representative to which our work and service bears no correspondence. We cannot imitate that work of His as we can imitate His acceptable service. We must separate for ever all thoughts of atonement or restitution for sin from our service of God. This surely is the truth of the Gospel, and to this truth the law of the offerings is adapted. Meanwhile it is made clear by that law that while those who are accepted on account of the perfect service of Another are bound and are able to render acceptable service themselves, it is the service of that Other and not of themselves by which they are accepted. This is made clear in the first place by a law of burnt-offerings for accept-

¹ Gen. III. 17.² Eccles. v. 9.³ *Ib.* vi. 7.⁴ Titus II. 14.

ance which makes no reference whatever to the accompanying meal-offering, followed by a law of meal-offerings which makes no reference whatever to a result of acceptance. And it is finally established by the appointment of two all-sufficient offerings for atonement and restitution, from which the meal- and drink-offerings are totally excluded.

The supposition that the meal-offering—with which we always connect the drink-offering—does really represent the personal service of the offerer, is strengthened by the fact that it never consisted of the raw product of the ground, but was always in a form which emphasized its preparation by human labour. Thus a sheaf of corn was not accepted as a meal-offering. It must be threshed and ground and presented in the form of meal. Neither were olive berries or grapes admissible, but the fruit of oliveyard and vineyard must be expressed and brought in the form of oil and of wine. The alternative forms of meal-offering still further expressed this idea by preparation of the flour in oven, baking-pan, or frying-pan. The significance of these regulations is clearly illustrated by the rule for a meal-offering of first-fruits. If the first-fruits of the field are offered as a meal-offering they must not be presented in their natural state, but in a prepared form, *grain in the ear parched with fire, bruised grain of the fresh ear*.¹ This provision evidently lays emphasis upon preparation by the hand of man as an essential of the meal-offering. In connection with this, and in further corroboration of our interpretation of the symbolism of the meal-offering, we recall the fact that at the consecration of Aaron the ram of the burnt-offering offered on his behalf was offered without the usual meal-offering.² In speaking of this service of consecration in a former chapter, we showed that Aaron was made like the true Mediator by the offering of a sin-offering and of a burnt-offering on his behalf. By the sin-offering he was made symbolically in the likeness of a person without sin. By the burnt-offering he was made symbolically like one who is possessed of a righteousness which God can accept. Now these offerings represented the work of Christ by which sin is covered and righteousness imputed. If then the meal-offering along with the burnt-offering represents the work of Christ, it is difficult to account for its being excluded from the ritual here. But if it does not at all represent the work of Christ, but only the personal service of the offerer, the explanation is clear and simple. The whole ob-

¹ Lev. II. 14.

² Ib. VIII. 18-21.

ject of the substitutionary offerings in the present case being to present Aaron in the likeness of Christ, and not at all connected with his personal approach to God through sacrifice, the thought of his personal service and devotion is alien to the occasion, and the usual meal-offering is accordingly omitted. One more illustration may be offered of the way in which this explanation of the meal-offering appears to satisfy the symbolism. We have already briefly noticed the meal-offering of the priests,¹ and we have explained it as symbolic of the personal service of the true Mediator. When He came into the world as Man He took upon Him the form of a servant; when He ascended into Heaven He spoke of Himself as ascending to His Father and to His God; He is anointed to fulfil now and for ever the purpose of God in the creation of man. Of this personal service of the Son of Man we believe the meal-offering of the priests to be a true picture and symbol; and it is remarkable that this is the solitary instance in the law of a meal-offering offered apart from a substitutionary offering. It seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the meal-offering is indeed made in the likeness of human service, which in the case of ourselves is offered through the merits and mediation of our Substitute and Representative, but in His own case is rendered directly by Him to the Creator.

We return now to our study of the law of meal-offerings. It is noticeable that the amount of flour to be offered is not specified in the second chapter of Leviticus. The following table will show the law of meal- and drink-offerings as laid down in view of the entry of the Israelites into Canaan:—²

Animal-offering.	Meal-offering.		Drink-offering.
	Flour.	Oil.	Wine.
For a lamb . . .	$\frac{1}{10}$ ephah.	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin.	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin.
For a ram . . .	$\frac{2}{10}$ ephah.	$\frac{1}{3}$ hin.	$\frac{1}{3}$ hin.
For a bullock . .	$\frac{3}{10}$ ephah.	$\frac{1}{2}$ hin.	$\frac{1}{2}$ hin.

The daily meal- and drink-offering in the tabernacle, which accompanied the morning and evening burnt-offering of a lamb, was in accordance with this scale.³ The flour might be offered as meal, or made up into cakes or wafers in several ways, but was probably always of the prescribed amount,⁴ according to the animal used for the burnt-offering or sacrifice with which it was presented. We shall consider later the fact that in the

¹ Lev. vi. 19-23.

² Exod. xxix. 40; Num. xxviii. 5, 7.

³ Num. xv.

⁴ Cf. Lev. vi. 20, 21.

offerings for the cleansing of a leper *three* tenth parts of an ephah are prescribed as the meal-offering to be offered with a single lamb of burnt-offering.¹ This is no doubt exceptional, but it may serve to show that no special significance attaches to the numbers in the regular scale of meal-offerings. It is evident that a larger meal-offering was required in the case of the larger sacrifice, which seems a natural and appropriate arrangement. The meal-offerings of the people became the perquisite of the priests, so that it was necessary to regulate the amount in some manner. This was done by a scale adapted to the powers of the offerer, as evidenced by the value of his animal-offering. No further significance need be sought for in this part of the ritual, which, as we have already remarked, is not referred to on the first occasion of regulating meal-offerings.

We come next to an important provision of the meal-offering, *he shall put frankincense thereon*,² that is the offerer himself shall do so when he brings his meal-offering. It is true that this detail is not expressly mentioned in connection with the meal-offerings presented in the form of cakes, but it is repeated in the meal-offering of first-fruits, *thou shalt lay frankincense thereon*.³ We cannot then be wrong in regarding the direction as an important feature of the symbolism of the meal-offering. But the constant significance of incense is prayer, so that the service is made like that of men who not only labour in all the manifold activities of human life, but who take pains to lift their labours to heaven by prayer. The words of the familiar hymn by Charles Wesley express exactly the truth to which the ritual of the meal-offering is here adapted.

Forth in Thy name, O Lord, I go,
My daily labour to pursue;
Thee, only Thee, resolved to know,
In all I think or speak or do.

The task Thy wisdom hath assigned
Oh let me cheerfully fulfil,
In all my works Thy presence find,
And prove Thy good and perfect will.

Thee may I set at my right hand,
Whose eyes my inmost substance see;
And labour on at Thy command,
And offer all my works to Thee.

¹ Lev. xiv. 10, 20; see ch. xviii. p. 319; cf. also Lev. xxiii. 13, for which see below, ch. xviii. p. 349.

² *Ib.* ii. 1.

³ *Ib.* 15.

Give me to bear Thy easy yoke,
And every moment watch and pray;
And still to things eternal look,
And hasten to Thy glorious day.

For Thee delightfully employ
Whate'er Thy bounteous grace hath given;
And run my course with even joy,
And closely walk with Thee to heaven.

We recall the fact that "pure frankincense"¹ was placed upon the shewbread in the holy place, where also it is a picture of prayer, that prayer by which our Redeemer lifted to God, as the Representative and Exemplar of the elect, the activities of His human existence. Surely it is not an over refinement to observe that His prayers are to be symbolized by "*pure* frankincense," while ours are sufficiently set forth by "frankincense," without that epithet which seems reserved for those things that are in a special sense a picture of Christ.² And indeed in that symbol which is particularly a picture of His intercession the pure frankincense is reinforced by fragrant spices,³ still more forcibly to represent the excellency of His prayer, and the fragrance of His devotion. But for that which is made like the service of His people it is sufficient that frankincense be placed by the offerer upon his oblation.

And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests. Here there is no mention of the entrance to the tent of meeting, nor of any laying on of hands by the offerer. The whole symbolism moves in a different region from that which we have trodden in considering the four substitutionary sacrifices. The offering is indeed an oblation which is to be brought near to God, but it is not the oblation by which entry to the place of meeting is secured. The offerer comes straight to Aaron's sons the priests, and puts the offering into their hands, to be presented by their mediation to God. The law is once more carefully adapted to a Gospel truth, namely that the oblation of consecrated lives is offered, not directly, but through the mediation of Christ.

And he shall take thereout his handful of the fine flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof. And the priest shall burn it as the memorial thereof upon the altar, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto Jehovah. It appears that the offerer himself takes a portion of the flour, and some of the oil, together with all the frankincense, and hands it to the priest, who offers it as a fire-offering of a

¹ Lev. xxiv. 7.

² Cf. ch. ix. p. 119.

³ Exod. xxx. 34.

sweet savour unto Jehovah, by turning it into smoke upon the altar. This is called *the memorial* of the meal-offering. We meet here for the first time in Scripture with the word translated "memorial".¹ This word seems to be a technical word of the law of offerings, and is applied, in those cases where an offering of meal was not wholly consumed, to that portion of it which was burnt upon the altar. Thus in the present case the handful of meal, a portion of the oil, and all the frankincense,² is technically the memorial of the meal-offering. In that form of the sin-offering where the tenth part of an ephah of flour was offered the handful burnt upon the altar is called its memorial.³ The pure frankincense placed upon each row of shewbread is said to *be to the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto Jehovah*,⁴ and was burnt no doubt upon the altar of incense. So also the handful of the meal-offering of jealousy which was burnt upon the altar is called the memorial of the offering.⁵ It is interesting to find in the prophet Isaiah a plain reference to this law of the meal-offerings in the words, *He that offereth a meal-offering is as he that offereth swine's blood; he that maketh-a-memorial of frankincense as he that blesseth an idol*.⁶ And the interpretation of the phrase is made clear by David in one of his Psalms, where he prays, *Jehovah remember all thy meal-offerings, and accept thy burnt-offerings*.⁷ It is certain then that that which is burnt upon the altar is, in the anthropomorphic language of Scripture, to bring to the remembrance of God that which is offered, whether it be the sweet savour of the ordinary meal-offering or the surrender of life figured by the sin-offering of one-tenth of an ephah of meal, or the "meal-offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance".⁸ It is in strict accordance with this phraseology and imagery that the angel addresses Cornelius, *Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial before God*.⁹ The godly and faithful life of Cornelius was like a meal-offering, and his prayers and alms like the memorial of it, ascending as a sweet savour into the presence of God. In somewhat similar language David had prayed, *Let my prayer be set forth as incense before Thee; the lifting up of my hands as the evening meal-offering*.¹⁰ We notice again in this part of the ritual that the offering is made through the mediating

¹ Heb. *Azkarah*; in Lev. II. 2, 9, 16; v. 12; VI. 15; XXIV. 7; and Num. v. 26 only. LXX, *μνημόσυνον*, except in Lev. XXIV. 7, where it is translated *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*.

² Cf. Lev. VI. 15.

³ *Ib.* v. 12.

⁴ *Ib.* XXIV. 7.

⁵ Num. v. 26.

⁶ Is. LXVI. 3.

⁷ Ps. XX. 3.

⁸ Num. v. 15.

⁹ Acts x. 4. Gk. *εἰς μνημόσυνον*.

¹⁰ Ps. CXLII. 2.

action of the priest. This point is frequently emphasized, as for example in the direction in verses 8 and 9, *the meal-offering shall be presented unto the priest, and he shall bring it unto the altar; and the priest shall take up from the meal-offering the memorial thereof, and shall burn it upon the altar*; and again in verse 16, *the priest shall burn the memorial of it*; and once more in a later chapter, *This is the law of the meal-offering; the sons of Aaron shall offer it before Jehovah, before the altar*.¹ It is unnecessary to enlarge upon the reason for the emphasis which is laid upon this point of ritual. It is undoubtedly intended to correspond with the comprehensive truth which our Lord enunciated, that no one comes to the Father except by Him. It is made like the fact that our spiritual sacrifices are *acceptable to God through Jesus Christ*.² If through Him we offer our sacrifice of praise, through Him also we offer our sacrifice of almsgiving.³ Every odour of sweet smell and sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God which we can render⁴ is offered in Christ and through Christ, the one and only mediating Priest between God and men.

And that which is left of the meal-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons, it is a thing most holy of the offerings of Jehovah made by fire. This direction is repeated in connection with the meal-offerings prepared in other ways,⁵ and it is given at greater length in a later oracle addressed specially to the priests. There we read of the meal-offering of flour, *That which is left thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat; it shall be eaten without leaven in a holy place; in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it. It shall not be baken with leaven. I have given it as their portion of my offerings made by fire; it is most holy, as the sin-offering and as the trespass-offering. Every male among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, as his portion for ever throughout your generations, from the offerings of Jehovah made by fire; whosoever toucheth them shall be holy*.⁶ The remainder of the flour of every meal-offering was then to be given to the priestly body as a whole, and was to be regarded as a most holy thing, equally with the flesh of the sin- and trespass-offerings. It was to be eaten only by the males among the children of Aaron, and to be kept from all contact with leaven in its preparation, and eaten in the court of the tabernacle, every person who touched it being holy, in

¹ Lev. vi. 14.² 1 Pet. ii. 5.³ Heb. xiii. 15-16. *Θυσία* in these connections undoubtedly points to the meal-offering.⁴ Phil. iv. 18; Rom. xii. 1.⁵ Verse 10.⁶ Lev. vi. 16-18.

the sense no doubt that he must undergo the washing of garments or person before mixing again in the life of the camp. If the meal-offering was baked in the oven, or prepared in the frying-pan or baking-pan, it became the property of the particular officiating priest, but in the offering of flour all the sons of Aaron shared in it, one as well as another, as already described.¹ It seems to be clearly stated that the remainder of the meal-offering is given to the priests as their portion and due, on the principle that those who wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar.² And yet we feel that there is perhaps a deeper meaning in the regulation. We have seen that in the ritual of peace-offerings the share of the Mediator in the fellowship which has been established appears to be emphasized, in accordance with the truth that our fellowship is not only with God, but also with His Son Jesus Christ. In the ritual of the sin- and trespass-offerings again the identity of the mediator with the victim is made clear by the priests alone consuming what remained of its flesh. In the rule for the treatment of meal-offerings we think that both these ideas may be present, the first perhaps more prominently, but the second also seems latent in the symbolism. We notice that the remainder is given to the priests as their portion, but not in the same sense as the hide of the burnt-offering, or the shoulder two cheeks and maw of the sacrifice of peace-offerings. These seem to have been mere perquisites and wages, and are not mentioned in the course of the prescribed ritual. In the present case the assignment is made as the priests' portion *of the offerings made by fire*, as if that which was offered to God for a sweet savour was also to be a grateful present to the priest. If this is indeed the case, we see in these laws not only a likeness to the fact that the Mediator Himself is a party to the fellowship which He has established between men and God, but also a notice of the truth that the acceptable service rendered to God by those on whose behalf He mediates is also a service rendered to Him. Those whose ambition it is to be well-pleasing to God are ambitious also to please Him. They are servants of God and the Lord Jesus Christ, but of no one else. To God and to His anointed Priest the meal-offering is sacred. But we are inclined, from the analogy of our interpretation of the ritual of the sin- and trespass-offerings, to see a further significance in the eating of the remainder of the meal-offering by the priests. We remark that the meal is

¹ Lev. VII, 9, 10.

² 1 Cor. IX, 13.

not only assigned to the priests but that they are directed to eat it; evidently as part of the ceremonial. This at least suggests a certain identity between the mediator and the offering. But we have seen reason to conclude that the offering in this case is not Christ, but the service of men rendered to God through Christ. It is not difficult to see in what sense this is symbolically identified with Him, when we recall the words of St. Paul that now he lives, yet not he, but Christ lives in him; or the words of our Lord Himself that our fruit is borne if we abide in Him, and live by His life. In a true sense our good works are the output of the life of Christ. It will be at least conceded that the law of meal-offerings which ordains that the meal which is over shall be eaten by the priest himself is patient of this interpretation. There remains for consideration only the statement that this meal reserved from the fire is to be regarded as most holy, like the remainder of the sin- and trespass-offerings, so much so indeed that whosoever touches it is holy. In speaking of the sin-offering we have already remarked upon the distinction between "holy" and "most holy" things.¹ The application of the epithet "most holy" to the meal-offering may be on account of its being wholly devoted to the service of God in the sanctuary, but this does not explain why this offering was so devoted, and this is the point which we have to consider. We have noticed that the meal-offering is attached to two of the substitutionary offerings, being the regular accompaniment of the fire-offering in burnt-offerings and in sacrifices of peace-offerings. We believe this to be significant of the certain truth that acceptance and fellowship with God are obtained for us by the work of Another only that we may ourselves live and serve God. The result of devoted service is in actual reality inseparable from the fact of salvation. But the meal-offering is specially excluded from the sin- and trespass-offerings, and this we have found to be significant not only of the fact that the work of dealing with our sins by way of atonement and restitution is taken out of our hands altogether, for the same may be said of the work by which our acceptance is assured and our fellowship is consummated; but rather of the additional truth that the service which the redeemed can render to God bears no relation whatever to the service by which their sins are removed. It does bear a resemblance, as copy resembles example, to the fire-offering of the Saviour's obedience on our behalf, and to

¹ Ch. XIII. p. 248.

that obeying of His Father's commandments by which He abode in His love and so won for us both acceptance and fellowship. We too—when accepted in the Beloved—may present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God; and we too keeping His commandments and walking in the light may enjoy fellowship with the Father and with His Son. But we can never copy His work of atonement or restitution for guilt, these being things which are to be let alone by us for ever. For this reason then the meal-offering is totally excluded from association with the sin- and trespass-offerings; but yet that dealing with the problem of sin by the Saviour alone is no mere legal fiction by which a sinful man may escape the consequences of his sins. It is directed, as we have seen in the ritual of the Day of Atonement, to the total removal of sin from human habitations. Its final end is the making of men as truly without sin as He is without sin. We know not what we shall be, but we know that we shall be like Him. And for this reason then, as we believe, the remainder of the meal-offering is made in the figure *as the sin-offering and as the trespass-offering*. If the Head is holy and imparts holiness, so shall the limbs be, in measure now, in completeness hereafter when our full salvation is revealed. We believe that the Church of Christ is destined to be as holy as the Temple is holy, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.¹ We believe that her service will be as His Person is, not only from the fact that her service is the output of His life in her, but also because in its nature and in its effects it will be the fulfilment in men of what has been first realized in the Son of Man.²

We have now concluded our study of the ritual of meal-offerings, but a few points remain to which we must briefly refer. These are the total exclusion of leaven, and also of honey, from every meal-offering, and the command to season every meal-offering with salt.

As regards leaven and honey we read: *No meal-offering, which ye shall offer unto Jehovah, shall be made with leaven; for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, as an offering made by fire unto Jehovah. As an oblation of first-fruits ye shall offer them unto Jehovah, but they shall not come up for a sweet savour on the altar.* The mention of honey in this connection is not easy to explain, and other Scriptures do not appear to throw much light upon it. There is a notice in Ezekiel of the fact

¹ Eph. II. 21; v. 26, 27.

² Comp. Heb. XII. 10; 2 Pet. I. 1-4.

that the Israelites were accustomed to set *fine flour and oil and honey* as a sweet savour before their idols,¹ and some have thought that the prohibition here may be intended to separate the meal-offering of Israel from current idolatrous ceremonies. In other passages of Scripture, however, honey appears rather as one of the chief products of the land, along with flour and oil.² Accordingly it might be offered as first-fruits, and it is interesting to read that in the time of Hezekiah "the children of Israel gave in abundance the first-fruits of grain, new wine, and oil, and *honey*, and of all the increase of the field".³ But honey is distinguished from grain and new wine and oil by being a natural product, not the result of man's labour; and this may be a sufficient reason for its not being allowed to form a meal-offering, the essential idea of which in the Divine scheme is to represent the labour of man. If then, as we have suggested above, there was a prevalent custom of offering honey as a *minchah* in current forms of worship, we can understand why it is not only omitted in the directions for meal-offerings, but also finds special mention here as forbidden for this purpose. At the same time we are ready to admit that from the form in which the prohibition is given there *appears* to be some property common to leaven and honey which causes their rejection, and if so, honey must in some way be regarded as containing an element of corruption, which is the well-known property of leaven. We are content to leave this point somewhat uncertain as regards the honey, for the significance of the exclusion of leaven is undoubted. It is in marked reference to the truth of the Gospel that the flesh cannot please God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be. The service which is pleasing to God is not mere activity,⁴ but the labour that proceedeth of love, the service of the regenerate heart, the fruit of the Spirit. If leaven is the symbol of corruption, salt is the symbol of continuance. God's covenants with the house of Aaron to give them the heave-offerings of Israel, and with the house of David to give him the kingdom, are termed covenants of salt because of their permanence.⁵ And in the present case the salt is described as *the salt of the covenant of thy God*. We cannot then be wrong in interpreting it in the meal-offering as indicative of the covenanted grace of God. In all our service for Him we are to "season" our labours with the recollection that it is

¹ Ezek. xvi. 19.² E.g. Deut. viii. 8; Jer. xli. 8; Ezek. xvi. 13.³ 2 Chron. xxxi. 5.⁴ Heb. xi. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 3.⁵ Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5.

His abiding presence which will subdue inward corruption and maintain continuance. *He shall confirm you unto the end, that ye be unreprouable in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful, through whom ye were called into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.*¹ Here is the truth that the perseverance of the saints is really the perseverance of God.

But it is deeply instructive to notice that the direction to season every oblation of the meal-offering with salt appears to be extended to every oblation. The words are: "Every oblation of thy meal-offering shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meal-offering; *with all thine oblations thou shalt offer salt*".² The custom of casting salt upon the animal-sacrifices is referred to by Ezekiel,³ and that large quantities of salt were required in the Temple services is elsewhere implied.⁴ We take the direction then to include every oblation whether of animal-sacrifice or of meal-offerings.⁵ And this is in accordance with the truth that the faithfulness of God is no less engaged to the whole work of Christ on our behalf than it is to our own work and service of Him.⁶

¹ 1 Cor. i. 8, 9. ² Lev. ii. 13. ³ Ezek. xliii. 24. ⁴ Ezra vi. 9; vii. 22.

⁵ It is probable that our Lord's reference to this in Mark ix. 49 is not in the true text. We do not therefore notice it here.

⁶ Is. xlix. 7.

CHAPTER XVII.

SOME SPECIAL OFFERINGS.

WE have now concluded our study of the Law of Offerings, and in the present chapter we propose briefly to examine the offerings prescribed on certain special occasions, with a view to testing the results at which we have arrived. If we find that the explanations which we have given of their symbolism account satisfactorily for the use of the offerings on these special occasions, we shall gain further confirmation of our results. It would be beside our purpose to examine at length each of the special services to which we shall refer, but it will be our aim to show the appropriateness of the offerings prescribed on each occasion.

I. THE FIRST DAY OF AARON'S MINISTRY.

The services of this day are described in the ninth chapter of Leviticus. It was on the day following the seven days of his consecration that Aaron was ordered to commence his ministry as mediator. He was to take a calf for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering for himself; and from the people he was to require a he-goat for a sin-offering, a calf and a lamb for a burnt-offering, and an ox and a ram for peace-offerings, together with a meal-offering mingled with oil. With these sacrifices he was to execute the duties of his office, and Jehovah promised to signify His acceptance of the service by a manifestation of His glory. Here we notice that all the offerings which it was to be the function of the priests to offer are represented, except the trespass-offering and the drink-offering. As regards the absence of the trespass-offering, it is obvious that on this occasion there is no special act of disobedience or trespass for which atonement is to be made by a sin- or trespass-offering; but atonement for sin was one of the chief duties of the priest-mediator, and must therefore find a place in his first public ministration. Accordingly, while the trespass-offering of restitution is omitted, the sin-offering of atonement

is prescribed, so that there may be a complete exhibition of functions. And indeed here, as always when one or more offerings are offered at the same time, the sin-offering of atonement takes the precedence. When offering for himself Aaron first presents the sin-offering and then the burnt-offering ; and so for the people the order of offering is first the sin-offering, next the burnt-offering and meal-offering, and finally the sacrifice of peace-offerings, in strict agreement with the message of the Gospel which first of all proclaims that Christ died for our sins. As regards the drink-offering, we believe that it is always present by implication when a meal-offering is mentioned. But if this appears unlikely, we may consider that the meal-offering stands for the meal- and drink-offerings, as the sin-offering stands for itself and for the trespass-offerings, in this first ministration of Aaron. It is noticeable that no meal-offering is here prescribed to accompany the burnt-offering of Aaron. We think that the explanation is that the sin-offering and burnt-offering of Aaron are simply a repetition of those which had been offered for him day by day during the seven days of his consecration so as to make him like the Son of God ; and we have already shown that a meal-offering was inapplicable in this connection. If this is so, the repetition of these offerings on each of the seven days, and yet once more on the first day of his ministration and before he commenced his mediatorial work for the people, is a striking testimony to the ineffectual character of the ritual. Indeed there is also a testimony to the fact that it is no mere ceremonial, for the glory of Jehovah appeared as the result of the ministrations, and there came forth fire from Jehovah, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat. But this is not on account of the blood of bulls and of goats, but on account of that reality to which by the Divine direction these sacrifices are made like. Our explanation of the sacrifices for Aaron as being identical in significance with the sacrifices offered for him on each day of his consecration, is supported by the fact that their ritual follows the ritual of those sacrifices, and in the case of the sin-offering varies slightly from the usual ritual. The blood of the regular sin-offering for the high priest was taken within the veil, while in these cases it is put upon the horns of the altar. In fact the only difference between the sacrifices for Aaron on the first day of his ministry and those in the ritual of his consecration, is that in the former "a calf" is substituted for "a bullock" as the sin-offering ; in all other respects the ritual is peculiar and identical. We

take them then to be significant of the same truth, namely, that the Mediator between God and men must be and is without sin, and possessed also of acceptable righteousness.

As regards the offerings for the people which Aaron presents for them, we notice that, with the exception of the sin-offering, two animals are prescribed for each kind of animal-offering, instead of the single animal usually offered. The reason for this in the present case is no doubt that Aaron was on this day offering specimen offerings, as it were, of all that he would be called upon to offer. The general rule for burnt- and peace-offerings was that they were to be from the herd and from the flock.¹ Here accordingly one animal of each kind is offered on behalf of the people.

Finally it is of interest and importance to note that on the first day of his ministry Aaron is not only shown as the acceptable mediator, but as one also who has access to God. At the close of the services of the day Moses and Aaron enter the tent of meeting, and come out and bless the people, whereupon the glory of Jehovah appears to the people. From that day onwards Moses resigns all priestly functions, which are henceforward exercised by the man who had been made like the true Mediator between God and men, and whose ministry had thus been publicly acknowledged.

2. THE CLEANSING OF THE LEPER.

A considerable section of the Book of Leviticus is occupied with the Law of Leprosy.² Rules are given to test the presence of leprosy, and for the conduct of the man who is pronounced a leper by the priest (XIII. 1-46). Leprosy might occur in garments, whether of linen or woollen stuff, or made of skin. Rules are laid down for the detection of this form of leprosy by the priest, and for the treatment of the garment so affected (XIII. 47-59). It seems that leprosy in human beings was sometimes cured, and in this case the man must be brought to the priest for inspection. If the priest pronounced him healed, an elaborate ceremonial was prescribed for the restoration of the leper to his full privileges as one of the congregation of God (XIV. 1-32). Finally there are directions given for the detection of leprosy in the walls of houses, and for the ceremonial cleansing and atonement of a house from which the leprosy has been removed, so that it may once more be inhabited by clean persons (XIV. 33-57). There is very much

¹ Lev. 1, 2,

² Chs. XIII., XIV.,

in these chapters which invites discussion, but which does not properly lie within the scope of our present enquiry. We only remark here that if the object of these regulations had been purely hygienic, it would surely have been sufficient to secure the segregation of lepers, without imposing upon the afflicted man such conditions as we find in this law. *The leper in whom the plague is*, we read, *his clothes shall be rent, and the hair of his head shall go loose, and he shall cover his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague is in him he shall be unclean; he is unclean; he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his dwelling be.*¹ Now it is clear that no one of the points which are mentioned here, except the crying unclean and the living without the camp, can have anything to do with the risk of contagion. But it is a well-known fact that the rending of clothes and letting the hair go loose,² the covering of the upper lip,³ the crying Unclean, unclean, so as to warn people from contact,⁴ and even the segregation without the camp,⁵ are each and all the recognized signs of mourning for the dead, or the prescribed rule for those who are ceremonially defiled by contact with a corpse. The leper then is to be a man mourning at his own funeral, and polluted by contact with his own corpse. He is a living picture of death. This is the condition to which leprosy reduced a man, according to the law of God. Can we doubt that we have in leprosy a Divine picture of sin, by which men become dead in the sight of God, not only in the sense of being exposed to the punishment of death, in all which that implies for a human being, but much more in the sense of alienation from the life of God, which is the death in trespasses and sins of which the Gospel speaks? It is interesting to note in corroboration of this that in the Book of Numbers *every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead*⁶ are classed together under a common sentence of exclusion from the camp. The reason why dead bodies are regarded as a source of defilement is because death in men is the penalty of sin. A dead body is the body of one on whom the stroke of God has descended. The Israelite was constantly reminded of this truth by the law which declared minor defilement lasting till the evening to result from all contact with the dead bodies of unclean creatures, although contact with them while living did not impart defilement.⁷ And even to the

¹ Lev. XIII. 45, 46.² *Ib.* x. 6.³ Ezek. XXIV. 17.⁴ Lam. IV. 14, 15; Num. XIX. 22; Hag. II. 13.⁵ Num. v. 2, 3.⁶ *Ib.* v. 2.⁷ Lev. XI. 24-38.

dead bodies of clean animals, if they died without the ceremonial shedding of their blood, the same conditions applied.¹ But far more stringent regulations and a more elaborate ceremony of cleansing applied to those who were defiled by the dead body of a man.² By these rules men are reminded that death in men entered into the world by sin. The whole law of defilement by reason of issues in the man or in the woman³ is connected with the same truth. The human race is corrupted at its source, and in its propagation perpetuates a corrupt nature, and multiplies corrupt beings. For a full discussion of these laws we would refer the reader to a very illuminating exposition by the late Dr. Kellogg in the "Expositor's Bible". We only refer to them here as strengthening our conviction that we are to see in the condition of the leper, pronounced to be such by the priest, a picture of sinners dead in their trespasses and sins. In the return of the leper, therefore, to the congregation of God, we have a picture of the passing of the sinner out of death into life; and in the offerings and ceremonial of his cleansing there must be a likeness to the means by which this is effected.

Before we leave the subject of leprosy, however, we draw attention to the fact that the plague might appear either in the person, or upon the garments, or in the walls of a house. We cannot here discuss the different significance of these three manifestations of the disease, but only record our conviction that all alike are intended to represent the facts of sin, and, as a consequence, in the ceremonial of cleansing in each case, the truth also of the removal of sin. We think that leprosy in the person is made like sin in the nature; leprosy in the garments is a picture of sin in human actions; while leprosy in the house is like the effect of men's sins upon the country and upon the world in which men live. With these few words of introduction we pass now at once to consider the offerings for the cleansing of a leper, expecting to see in them a picture of the passage of a sinner from death unto life.

We notice here first of all that the decision, whether of exclusion from the camp or of re-admission, rests in all cases with the priest. But we have seen that the priest in the Mosaic system is made like the Son of God, so that in this regulation there is an exact correspondence with the truth that God has committed all judgment of men unto the Son. With Him who is the one Mediator between God and men rests their sentence of life or of death. This is, as we know, the con-

¹ Lev. xl. 39, 40.² Num. xix.³ Lev. xv.

stant witness of the Gospel.¹ We notice further that the cleansing of the leper is regarded as taking place by the act of God. It cannot but be significant that, while various means are suggested for the removal of leprosy from a garment,² there is no hint of any attempt to heal the leprous man. When once the priest has assured himself that the disease is the true *plague of leprosy*, the stricken man has no avenue of cure opened before him. For leprosy is distinctively a *plague*, the stroke of God,³ which God alone can remove. Aaron only expressed an actual fact when he spoke of Miriam struck with leprosy as being "like one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb".⁴ It was and it remains a disease which God alone can cure. The King of Israel exclaimed on receiving the letter asking him to recover Naaman of leprosy, *Am I God to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?*⁵ And this fact it is which makes the leprous condition to be such a true picture of spiritual death in trespasses and sins. But if no remedial measures on his own part, or on the part of others, are suggested for a leprous man, it is clear that the possibility of a healing act of God is contemplated. Otherwise there would be no need to speak of a *day of his cleansing*. The ceremonies which we are about to consider presuppose that *the plague of leprosy is healed in the leper*.⁶ This promise is again true to the fact of the Gospel that *even when we were dead through our trespasses God made us alive*.⁷

The ceremonies which were performed for the cleansing of the leper were not his actual healing. That healing had already taken place by the free mercy of God, such healing as God granted to Miriam in answer to the prayer of Moses,⁸ and our Lord granted to lepers in His day.⁹ The ceremonies in the day of the leper's cleansing were the authoritative attestation of the fact; they conveyed to him the outward status, and they gave to him official recognition, corresponding to the mercy which he had already received. In the language of the Church of Christ, they were the sacrament of his passing from death into life. We may be sure then that they were made like the thing which the cleansing of a leper

¹ E.g. John v. 22, 27; Acts x. 42; xvii. 31.

² Lev. xiii. 47-58.

³ The word "plague" which occurs frequently in Lev. xiii. and xiv. is used specially of a stroke of God; e.g. Gen. xii. 17; Exod. xi. 1; Deut. xxiv. 8; Ps. xxxix. 10; Is. liii. 8.

⁴ Num. xii. 12.

⁵ 2 Kings v. 7.

⁶ Lev. xiv. 2, 3.

⁷ Eph. ii. 5.

⁸ Num. xii. 13.

⁹ Luke v. 13, 14; xvii. 14.

signified. There must be in these ceremonies and in these offerings some real likeness to the truth that God makes us alive *together with Christ, and raises us up with Him*.¹

The ritual for the cleansing of a leper falls into two divisions, the first part taking place without the camp, and the second being performed at the entrance to the tent of meeting. It does not seem, however, that these are to be regarded as one ceremony but as two, the first being the sacrament of new life, and the second of renewed service.

To the leper outside the camp who knows in himself that he is healed of his plague the priest is then to go, and to satisfy himself that the miracle has really taken place. Assured of this he is to give to the cleansed man the tokens of his cleansing, and formally to admit him, first to life once more within the camp, and then to service in the tent of meeting. Let us briefly consider the ritual on each occasion.

Outside the camp *the priest shall command to take for him that is to be cleansed two living clean birds, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop*, and also an earthen vessel containing *living water*.²

By "clean birds" we understand birds which were admissible for offering, that is turtle-doves or young pigeons. These are to be taken *for him that is to be cleansed*, that is to be his substitutionary offerings. We think that this is the meaning of the phrase, both from the analogy of burnt- and sin-offerings of birds, and also because in the case of the cleansing of a house the phraseology is altered. Here the offerings are taken "for the man," there they are taken "to cleanse the house".³ If, as we believe, these offerings represent Christ, the distinction is important and necessary. It is specially to be remarked that the birds are here noted as *living* birds, possessed in their life of that very property of which the leprous man was deprived. He is a picture of men dead in trespasses and sins. Here is the picture of a Substitute who is alive towards God. Once again we notice that in the cleansing of a house, both epithets of "living" and "clean" are dropped, and we read only of *two birds*; for in that case the offering is not strictly for the house, and therefore the word "clean," which is connected with substitutionary victims, is omitted; neither is there in view a passage of the house from death to life, so that the word "living" is also avoided. But in the cleansing of the leper the offering is truly substitution-

¹ Eph. ii. 5, 6.

² Lev. xiv. 4, 5.

³ *Ib.* 49.

ary, like all those others for which certain living creatures are provided and termed "clean," and it is with the express purpose of showing how the sinner passes from death into life, so that the birds must be emphasized as "living" and "clean". With these are to be provided *cedar-wood and scarlet and hyssop*. It seems certain that we are to attach some significance to these three things, and not to regard them simply as together forming a sprinkler. It is true that on the occasion of the first passover the Israelites are directed to sprinkle the blood on the lintel and side posts with *a bunch of hyssop*.¹ The water for impurity was also sprinkled by means of hyssop.² But we find the same three substances which are mentioned here cast into the burning of the red heifer,³ where there can be no object of sprinkling in the provision of hyssop. We are inclined therefore to search for some significance in the collocation of these three, and since they are united in the ritual here with the birds, and in Numbers with the red heifer, we think that they must be in some way significant of Christ. We notice further that both here and in the ritual of the red heifer a true life-surrender of atonement takes place, but in each case apart from the altar. May it not then be that cedar-wood and scarlet and hyssop are intended in some way to be a memorial of the work of Christ as represented on the altar? And if so, the precious cedar-wood⁴ may answer to His burnt-offering of consecration, which would otherwise be unrepresented in these two ceremonies; the scarlet thread meanwhile being reminiscent of His blood-shedding,⁵ the token of which is never far distant in every picture of the Christ. The hyssop we regard as significant of the *application* of the work of Christ, as it seems elsewhere to be the usual instrument of sprinkling, by which means the virtues of blood or of water are applied. There remains the living water. It is not easy to see why the Revisers have preferred the rendering "running water," since the epithet given to the water is in the original the same as that which is used for the birds, and the whole emphasis seems to lie upon the presence of life. It is clear, moreover, that the water was not running at the time of its use, since it was contained in an earthen vessel. We think that the earthen vessel has no special significance, being

¹ Exod. xii. 22.

² Num. xix. 18; cf. Ps. li. 7.

³ Num. xix. 6.

⁴ This wood must have been rare in the wilderness, and in the Temple was used in the sanctuary.

⁵ The only indication which Scripture gives of the colour intended is in Cant. iv. 3: "Thy lips are like a thread of scarlet," which is so far confirmatory of the suggested symbolism here.

simply the receptacle for the living or spring water. It was no doubt broken after having been put to a sacred use, according to the constant custom in such cases. But the significance of living water in the present connection cannot be mistaken, in the light of Scripture as a whole. It undoubtedly refers to the Holy Spirit whom we acknowledge to be "the Giver of Life," or at least it refers to that life which He gives.¹ The ritual for the use of these things, thus provided, is as follows:—

The priest shall command to kill one of the birds in an earthen vessel over living water. As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the living water; and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let go the living bird into the open field.

We have been accustomed in our previous study to find a combination of symbols used to represent the work of Christ. Here we have another example of such a combination. There is an earthen vessel in which the blood of a slain bird is mingled with living water. With this the living bird and the cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop are identified by being together dipped within it. All these things combine to give a picture of the Christ. He offered Himself, as we have seen in all the substitutionary offerings, to be a sweet savour to God, and shed His blood in atonement for sin; and not on His own account, but so that the whole might be applied to us for our salvation; of these great truths we believe the cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop to be here the silent memorial and witness. But the special truth about Christ which is here foreshadowed, and on which the whole emphasis lies, is that of His rising again from the dead, and of His being in virtue of this the source of life to the spiritually dead. The death and resurrection of Christ are most clearly shown by the *dipping of the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed² over the living water, and letting go the living bird into the open field.* It is surely significant that the bird is said to be dipped in the blood, and not in the blood and the water. No doubt it was necessary that the blood should be caught in the water, so as to have sufficient fluid for a dipping to take place; but the significance of the act is definitely connected with the blood

¹ So in Ezek. XLVII. 9; Zech. XIV. 8; John IV. 10; VII. 37-39.

² Notice the word; it is, as always, the blood of death,

and not with the water. It is to show that the bird which lived and was let go, lived not merely through death, but out of death. In the actual fact to which these things are made like, Christ died and rose again and revived. But was the living water then merely the means by which the scanty blood of the slain bird was made available for a ritual purpose? Not so indeed; it was in readiness for the rite of sprinkling, and so, tinged with the blood of atonement, it is sprinkled¹ upon the erstwhile leper, and the priest pronounces him clean. We see here a plain reference to that fact of the Gospel of which a notable sign was given as our Lord Jesus hung upon the cross. From His pierced side there came out blood and water.² In this sign there lay a promise of atonement for sin and of life by the Spirit, to be imparted by the crucified Saviour. When at length He had risen from the dead and ascended into Heaven He fulfilled the promise of this sign according to that first proclamation of the Gospel, *Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*³

But we see in this ritual of dipping and of sprinkling not only a picture of the death and resurrection of Christ, and of the application of its virtue to the man dead in trespasses and sins. We cannot but be struck by the correspondence of both parts of the ceremony with the rite of Christian baptism, of which St. Peter has asserted, in the passage just quoted, that it confers upon the penitent and believing the remission of their sins, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. The complete form of Christian baptism is, we think, a plunge and an emergence, just such a plunge and emergence as that of the living bird in the blood of that which was slain. But we believe that from primitive times an alternative form by sprinkling has also been practised, in exact accordance with the corresponding rite of the Old Covenant. But whether by a closer imitation of that death and resurrection which brings life to us, or by a mere act of aspersion of baptismal water, we too have our sacrament of regeneration, of which the ancient ceremony for cleansing the leper seems a kind of forerunner.

Meanwhile St. Paul himself has supplied us with the fullest commentary on the significance of this rite of cleansing. *We were buried with Christ*, he says, *through baptism into death*,

¹ The text does not say with the hyssop; and we are inclined to think that it may have been by hand (cf. verse 16).

² John XIX. 34.

³ Acts II. 38.

*that like as Christ was raised from the dead . . . so we also might walk in newness of life. . . . If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him ; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more, death no more hath dominion over Him. For the death that He died, He died unto sin once ; but the life that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus.*¹

The leper pronounced clean must wash his clothes, and shave his hair, and bathe himself in water, and so come into the camp, but still abide outside his tent for seven days. On the seventh day he must go through the same actions preparatory to presenting himself at the tent of meeting on the eighth day. We think that this ordinance was intended to deepen in the leper who had been cleansed the conception of his complete severance from the defilements of his leprous condition. It answers to the claim upon those who have passed from spiritual death to the life towards God, that they shall make a complete renunciation of the old condition and of its deeds. The order of the Divine thought in this law corresponds exactly with that expressed through the Apostle, who follows his exposition of our new life in Christ with the exhortation, *Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof ; neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness ; but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.*² The Passover, which we may call a sacrament of redemption, was followed by the seven days of unleavened bread, denoting the obligation which rests upon the redeemed to put away the leaven of malice and wickedness all the days of their life. In a similar manner the cleansing of the leper without the camp, which is a sacrament of regeneration, is followed by seven days of purification ; and denotes that those who are alive from the dead must put away dead works, and present the picture of a total and continuous service of the living God.

The ceremony which we have just considered we have called the sacrament of new life ; we have now to consider the sacrament of new service. This took place on the eighth day, a day which is in Scripture always significant of new birth and new beginnings. On this day then the leper, now once more a living man, appears in the tent of meeting, and takes

¹ Rom. VI. 1-11 ; cf. Titus III. 4-7.

² Rom. VI. 12, 13.

upon himself the service of God. As regards this service we note that it consisted of a trespass-offering with special rites, and also of a sin- and a burnt-offering, with the latter of which a meal-offering is presented. It is evident that the main emphasis lies upon the he-lamb for a trespass-offering, as in both the alternative forms of ritual the ceremonies connected with this he-lamb are identical and are prescribed at length.¹ This being of the essence of the service is not susceptible of reduction. It is different with the sin- and the burnt-offerings. These might be an ewe-lamb for a sin-offering and a he-lamb for a burnt-offering, or else two turtle-doves or two young pigeons in place of the larger offerings. The meal-offering in the former case consisted of three tenth parts of an ephah of flour mingled with oil, and in the latter case of only one tenth part.² A superficial reading of these regulations might connect the larger meal-offering of three tenth parts of an ephah of flour with the three animals, especially as in the lesser offering, where there is only one animal, the meal-offering is reduced to one tenth part of an ephah. If this were the case we should have here an instance of a meal-offering associated with both sin- and trespass-offerings, which would be contrary to conclusions at which we have arrived in our study of these offerings. But it is to be noticed that in the ritual the meal-offering is in each case associated with the burnt-offering, and not with the trespass- and sin-offerings.³ We must then regard the appointment in this case of a meal-offering of three tenth parts of an ephah to accompany the burnt-offering of a he-lamb as exceptional. We account for the exception by the fact that this whole ceremony is symbolic of the idea of service, and it is therefore to be expected that the symbol of the personal service of the offerer should assume special proportions. This explanation is confirmed by the prescription of a meal-offering of one tenth part of an ephah even in the reduced form of offering. Here the burnt-offering of a he-lamb is exchanged for that of a bird, and in such a case the meal-offering which accompanied every burnt-offering of a lamb would ordinarily have been altogether omitted. In this special case, however, it is merely reduced from three tenth parts to one tenth part of an ephah. The conclusion is undoubted that the meal-offering is an essential part of this service.

We arrive then at the result that the trespass-offering and

¹ Lev. xiv. 10-18 and 21-29.

² *Ib.* 10, 21.

³ *Ib.* 20, 31.

the meal-offering are the leading characteristics of this ceremony, on account of which we have given to it the name of a sacrament of new service. And of these two the ritual of the trespass-offering is of course the most elaborate, and the most significant. We have seen reason in a former chapter to conclude that the trespass-offering is symbolic of restitution for lack of service made for us by our Substitute and Representative. And it is this truth which seems specially in point here. The leper is regarded as having committed a trespass, in the technical sense of the word, during the period of his exclusion from the camp. When he comes once more to present himself in the tent of meeting as a servant of God, the first requirement is that restitution shall be formally made for his long neglect of service. This is done by the offering of a he-lamb for a trespass-offering. It is particularly interesting to note, what seems to be a peculiarity of this occasion, that the he-lamb is *to be waved*. This circumstance finds special mention on each occasion.¹ We have seen that the ceremonies of heaving and waving denote the presentation of what is heaved or waved to God for His use, whether in the general service of His house or of its ministers, or in a symbolic ritual. Thus the constituents for the feast on the sacrifice of peace-offerings were presented to God in this way so that He might use them in spreading His Table. And similarly on the present occasion the lamb for a trespass-offering is first to be waved and then offered, in order that it may be made quite plain that it is God who makes restitution for the offerer, and not the offerer who makes restitution to God. In the regular ritual for the substitutionary offerings it is provided that the offerer shall bring his own oblation, not in contradiction to the truth that it is God Himself who provides the Substitute and Representative of men, but so as to emphasize the complementary truth that men must individually rely upon the Substitute whom God has provided. On the present occasion, however, the fact that it is God who makes the provision for restitution, and not the man, is specially in point, and accordingly the trespass-offering is to be waved before it is offered. A log of oil, which is distinguished from the oil of the meal-offering,² was also waved along with the lamb for use in the ceremony. The ritual observed in the offering of the trespass-offering followed no doubt the regular ritual,³ but with one significant addition. The priest takes of

¹ Verses 12, 21.² Verse 10.³ Verse 13.

the blood and puts it upon the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of the right foot of the man to be cleansed. This ceremony may be compared with a similar use of the blood of the ram of consecration in the consecration of the high priest. But the difference between the two is very marked. The putting of the blood of the ram of consecration upon the high priest we took to be an indication of the fact that the offering which the true High Priest is appointed to offer is none other than the offering of Himself. But here there is no previous "filling of the hands" of the offerer with the offering whose blood is applied to his ear and hand and foot. On the contrary, some special care has been taken to emphasize the fact that the trespass-offering is *not* identified with the man, but is provided for Him by God. What then are we to understand by the application of the blood of the trespass-offering to these parts of the body of the cleansed leper? And to what truth of the service of God by the regenerate is the ceremony made like? We think that it corresponds to the truth that when a man has passed from death unto life, and has been assured that due restitution for sins that are past has been made, his whole bodily activities are henceforth to be engaged in the service of God. But these activities are to be exercised always through the blood which atoned for his sins. It is that atonement which cleanses the conscience from dead works to serve the living God,¹ whether as a moving force,² or as an objective fact;³ and in the power of that atonement then the new life for ear and hand and foot is entered upon. But there is another secret of the regenerate life of service which must find recognition here, and that is the enduement with the Holy Spirit of God. We have seen that His presence and influence in the passage of a soul from death to life has been represented in the ceremony of cleansing which took place outside the camp. His presence and power in all the activities of the new life which He gives is not to be without its due representation here. The priest takes the oil which has been prepared, and pouring some of it into the palm of his left hand, he dips his right finger into it, and puts it upon the ear and thumb and foot of the man to be cleansed, in the same spots where the blood had been placed. But before doing so he *sprinkles of the oil with his finger seven times before Jehovah*, that is no doubt in the direction of the sanctuary. We have

¹ Heb. ix. 14.² 2 Cor. v. 14.³ 1 John i. 6, 7.

no hesitation in deciding that a likeness is here intended to the influence and power of the Holy Spirit in the regenerate life. This is not indeed the holy anointing oil of the sanctuary, which could scarcely have been used for any other purpose than that for which it was specifically prepared. But neither on the other hand is it the ordinary oil of the meal-offering. It is brought for use in a separate vessel, and it receives a special consecration by being sprinkled seven times before Jehovah. This marks it as of peculiar significance. Its application then to ear and hand and foot *upon the blood of the trespass-offering* is a true and striking likeness to the twin powers by which the new life is sustained and quickened; for the law by which we are made free from the law of sin and of death is *the law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as a sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh, that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.*¹ The rest of the oil which was in the priest's hand was then put upon the head of the man to be cleansed, as a consecration of his whole body to the service of Jehovah, and in strict accordance with the truth of that sanctification of the Spirit in which the new life is begun and carried on.² With this act the ceremony of atonement by the trespass-offering is concluded. We have seen that the whole is occupied with the facts of restitution for the days of service that were lost, and of endowment and equipment for the life of service in the future.

When this service is completed, the sin-offering of atonement and the burnt-offering of acceptance are offered, evidently with their well-known and constant reference, and the ceremony is concluded by a meal-offering of special dimensions, so that the whole may close upon the note of personal service, to which the renewed life is dedicated.

We have now examined the special offerings connected with the cleansing of the leper, and have obtained confirmation of the explanations of the offerings which have been given in former chapters.

We have next to speak briefly of leprosy in garments and in houses. With regard to leprosy in garments, the law concerning this matter is closely connected with the law of leprosy in man.³ It is interesting to notice that the garment

¹ Rom. VIII. 2-4.² I Pet. I. 2; I John II. 27.³ Lev. XIII. 47-59.

is in each case submitted to the inspection of the priest. If the plague spreads in the garment, it is to be at once burned with fire; if it does not spread, but after washing and a further inspection does not change its colour, it is likewise burnt. If it does not spread, and becomes dim in appearance, the priest shall rend out the part affected; if, after this, it reappears, it is to be burnt. If, on the other hand, it disappears, it is to be washed a second time, and may then be used. Both in the Old Testament and in the New garments and clothing are used as figures of the actions of men, whether good or bad;¹ and the simile is striking and natural, as denoting the appearance which men present to the eye. We regard the leprous garment therefore as a picture of actions which spring from the unregenerate nature. It is possible that St. Jude had this law in his mind when he spoke of *the garment spotted by the flesh*² as a thing which Christians must hate. We must remember that we are not considering now the case of a leprous man, but of a clean and living Israelite in whose garment appeared a plague spot. If the plague spot was inveterate, whether it spread in the garment or simply worked inwards, nothing remained but to destroy the garment with fire at the word of the priest. There seems to be a correspondence with the injunction of our Lord to pluck out the offending eye, and cut off the offending hand and foot, rather than suffer the whole body to be cast into the fires of Gehenna. But in many cases there is room for the washing of repentance and firm resolution, and opportunity for the rending out of our lives of that which is defiled by the merciful severity of our Priest; and if the plague is departed from our actions by these means, they shall be washed the second time and be clean. It is clear that if our interpretation of this symbol is correct, there is place here only for healing or for cutting out, and not for an offering of atonement; and accordingly we find no such offering in connection with the leprosy of a garment. The leprosy of a house, the law for which follows after the law for the cleansing of a leper, is, however, different.³ This law is given in connection with the prospective entry of the Israelites into the land of Canaan, the land of their possession. We find here remedial measures similar to those which we have noted in the case of leprosy in a garment. When the plague is present the stones affected are to be removed, and the

¹ E.g. Job xxix. 14; Ps. lxxiii. 6; cix. 18; cxxxii. 9; Is. lix. 17; Zech. iii. 3; Col. iii. 12, 14; 1 Pet. v. 5; Rev. xix. 8.

² Jude 23.

³ Lev. xiv. 33-53.

whole interior scraped, and plastered afresh. If the plague reappears after this treatment, the whole house is to be destroyed, and its materials carried out of the city to an unclean place. If, however, a cure is effected, the house is pronounced clean and may be inhabited. But the ceremony which we have described as the sacrament of new life must be performed *to cleanse the house,*¹ and *to make atonement for it.*² We have already noticed certain changes in the phraseology which show that the making atonement for the house is not to be understood in the same sense as making atonement for the man, but simply as rendering the house clean for habitation. We believe that there is a reference here to certain revealed truths of Scripture connected with this world in which men live. It is the testimony of the Old and New Testament alike that the sin of men has injuriously affected the condition of created things,³ and that this has taken place by the decree of God. This fact may indeed account for the striking variation of phrase at the beginning of this section, where God speaks of Himself putting the plague of leprosy in the house.⁴ But however this may be, the fact remains that the creation is injuriously affected by the sins of men. Remedial measures have been taken when the sin of men has more especially defiled the land, as at the Flood,⁵ the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah,⁶ the expulsion of the Canaanitish nations,⁷ the Babylonish captivity,⁸ the destruction of Jerusalem.⁹ And these measures have been temporarily successful in the removal of a plague spot, so that the world continued a fit habitation for the people of God. But it was made clear once and for all after that first signal cleansing of the world, that it remains with its continual interchange of seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night, only because of the acceptable sacrifice of the Divine Saviour.¹⁰ And to this fact the law of the leprosy of houses is made to correspond by the institution of an offering of atonement that the house may be cleansed.

3. CEREMONIAL UNCLEANNESS AND DEFILEMENT BY THE DEAD.

In the Book of Numbers we find the following direction given by God to Moses: *Command the children of Israel that*

¹ Verses 49, 52.

² Verse 53.

³ Gen. III. 17, 18; Rom. VIII. 20.

⁴ Lev. XIV. 34.

⁵ Gen. VI. 11.

⁶ *Ib.* XIX. 13.

⁷ Lev. XVIII. 25.

⁸ Jer. XLIV. 2-6.

⁹ Matt. XXVII. 25; and compare generally Zech. v. 3, 4; Is. XXIV. 5, 6, 20.

¹⁰ Gen. VIII. 20-22.

*they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead: both male and female shall ye put out, without the camp shall ye put them; that they defile not their camp, in the midst whereof I dwell.*¹

It is beside our purpose to discuss the questions concerned with the observance of this law; for we are concerned chiefly with the spiritual truths to which we believe it to have been adapted. In the preceding section we have already considered the law for the exclusion of the leper; we have now to consider the law in the cases of defilement by issues or through contact with the dead.

The Law for Ceremonial Uncleannesses follows in the Book of Leviticus immediately after the Law of Leprosy,² and the sentence of exclusion from the camp recorded in Numbers appears to be an addition to this law. There can be no doubt that the sentence of ceremonial defilement by reason of issues is due to the sure fact of original or birth sin, to which the whole of Scripture unwaveringly testifies. Even the normal processes of the generative organs are on this account regarded as conveying a ceremonial defilement until the evening and necessitating purification by ablutions.³ But when the issue is abnormal, the defilement is regarded as more serious, and calls for offerings of purification.⁴ It is to this form of defilement by issues, we believe, that the sentence of exclusion from the camp is afterwards attached. When the issue is at an end, a special purification is to be undergone, to which we must now briefly refer. The ritual⁵ follows, generally, that which had been prescribed for the cleansing of a leper, but in a curtailed form. The sufferer by an abnormal issue had been, like the leper, excluded from the camp, but without all the insignia of death which were characteristic of the excluded leper.⁶ Accordingly there is no ceremony of life from the dead when he is cleansed of his issue. He returns at once to the camp for the seven days of purification. This purification also is simpler than in the case of a cleansed leper, as only one purification by water is referred to, and no shaving of the hair is prescribed. At the same time there is one additional requirement which suggests that a common reference underlies the purifications of the leper and of the sufferer from an issue. The latter is to bathe himself, we are told, in *living* water,⁷ a detail which is not re-

¹ Num. v. 2, 3.

² Lev. xv.

³ *Ib.* 16-18; and compare *Ib.* xii.

⁴ *Ib.* xv. 1-15, 25-30.

⁵ *Ib.* 13-15, 28-30.

⁶ In this way we may suppose the additional requirement in Numbers to have been fulfilled.

⁷ Lev. xv. 13.

ferred to in the purification of a leper.¹ The word in this connection suggests that the birth sin, of which the uncleanness of issues is symbolical, is not a defilement merely, but an occasion of death. For this reason also the renewed life towards Jehovah is begun on the eighth day, when the man who has been healed appears at the entrance to the tent of meeting with the two birds, one as a sin-offering, and the other as a burnt-offering. The trespass- and meal-offerings of the healed leper are omitted here, because during the days of his exclusion from the camp the sufferer by an issue had been made the picture of a corrupt nature, and not of a suspended life. There is indeed a hint, as we have remarked above, that a corrupt nature is an occasion of death; this, however, is not the point on which the emphasis lies; it is made to rest rather on the illustration of that fact which was known to every Israelite, and which it was one of the objects of the law to impress, that men are conceived and born in sin.²

With regard to Defilement by the Dead there does not appear to be any record in Scripture of such a conception before the time of Moses; and it was certainly not formed by the Israelites during their sojourn in Egypt, where the very opposite views on the subject prevailed. It seems to have had its origin in the laws of God given at this time, and in connection with the great emphasis which was being laid upon sin, and upon death as the consequence of sin. The first law on the subject of defilement by contact with death is in connection with the dietary laws recorded in the Book of Leviticus. It is there laid down that ceremonial defilement is contracted by contact with the dead bodies of all unclean animals, and even with the dead bodies of clean animals, if their blood had not been previously poured out.³ This enactment seems to have extended in practice to contact with the dead bodies of men, for a very short time after it was made, and before the people set out from Sinai, those who are *unclean by the dead* are mentioned together with lepers and those who have an issue as a recognized class.⁴ It was then ordained that these three classes were to be excluded from the camp, and it is recorded that the Israelites at once obeyed the injunction. Sentence of exclusion from the camp had already been pronounced against the lepers, but it is possible that the law had not at this early stage been put into effect. As regards sufferers from issues, their ceremonial defilement had already been de-

¹ Lev. xiv. 8, 9.² Gen. viii. 21; Ps. li. 5.³ Lev. xi.⁴ Num. v. 2; cf. also Lev. xxii. 4.

creed, and the manner of their cleansing, but without sentencing them to exclusion from the camp. We have already shown how this addition to that law might have been complied with without alteration of the existing rules. But as regards defilement by the dead no laws determining its period, or regulating its purification, had so far been promulgated. It is obvious that very practical difficulties would be felt in carrying out this command, far greater difficulties indeed than would be experienced in connection with sufferers from leprosy or by issues. We are therefore inclined to think that the law which was subsequently given¹ was intended to modify the present injunction. The Divine method is first to pronounce an absolute sentence of exclusion against those who are defiled by the dead, and then to provide a permanent substitute, as it were, for them, who bears their sentence of exclusion in his own person. The virtues of this substitutionary atonement are conveyed to the defiled person so that he may remain in the camp, and be purified from his uncleanness. This we believe to be the true genesis and meaning of this remarkable ordinance, and the consideration will prepare us to see in the red heifer a picture of the work of Christ.²

In confirmation of this we notice first of all that the red heifer is twice spoken of as *a sin-offering*.³ But the animal is not offered like the regular sin-offerings in atonement for a particular sin; its ashes are kept to mix with water, for the cleansing of all persons who are defiled by contact with death, which is the outward and visible sign of the presence of sin. Now we know that it is Jesus Christ who is the true and only Sin-offering, so that we are again assured that the red heifer is made like Him.

We observe then that the heifer is to be one *without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke*. The usual requirement in offerings that they shall be "without blemish" is doubly emphasized in this offering, and the condition is added that no yoke shall have come upon it.⁴ We may compare with the latter condition the rule that the altar on which offerings are made must be of earth or of unhewn stone, *for if thou lift up thy tool upon it thou hast polluted it*.⁵ The offering which is to cleanse men from impurity must then itself be free from all impurities, whether inherent or contracted. In this way only can it be a true picture of the Son of God. The fact that a heifer is prescribed instead of the usual "young

¹ Num. xix.² Heb. ix. 13, 14.³ Num. xix. 9, 17.⁴ Cf. Deut. xxi. 3.⁵ Exod. xx. 24, 25.

bullock" or "he-goat" of sin-offerings for the congregation may be without special significance.

It is probable that the animal is designedly varied on account of the peculiarity of the service. But we think that the designation of the heifer as a *red* heifer cannot be without meaning. We believe that the assigned colour is connected with the essential idea of all sin-offerings, which is, as we have seen, atonement by blood-shedding. It is true that we have just explained another colour to be emblematic of the blood-shedding of the altar, namely the scarlet which we find associated with cedar-wood and hyssop in the offerings for a leper, and also in the present offering. We showed that in the poetical language of the Song of Songs the flush of rosy lips is compared to a "thread of scarlet". But in this same Song the flush of health on the cheeks is termed "red,"¹ and the same epithet occurs elsewhere as descriptive of the appearance of blood. We read that on a certain memorable occasion "early in the morning the sun shone upon the water, and the Moabites saw the water over against them as red as blood; and they said, This is blood".² So that we may well believe that the colour was suggestive to the Israelite mind of blood. It is not difficult to account for the variation of scarlet and red, both with the same general reference. From the large use of scarlet thread in the construction of the tabernacle curtains and the high-priest's garments we gather that a dye of this colour was easily obtainable. But we do not read in Scripture, except in symbolic figures,³ of any animal of this colour, while red horses are mentioned in Zechariah along with sorrel and white.⁴ We think then that there is good reason to believe that a red heifer is designated for this offering to emphasize the fact that *it is a sin-offering*.⁵

The ritual for the offering of the heifer is as follows:—*Ye shall give her unto Eleazar the priest, and he shall bring her forth without the camp.* The heifer is brought by the whole congregation and given to the priest because the whole congregation is to share in the benefit. The hands of priest or elders are not laid upon it because it is offered in anticipation of the future need of individuals, and not for sins which have been already committed by the congregation. We think that the bringing forth of the heifer without the camp is

¹ Cant. v. 10.

² 2 Kings III. 22, 23.

³ Rev. xvii. 3. κόκκινος, the word used in Lev. and Num. by the LXX translators.

⁴ Zech. i. 8.

⁵ Verse 9.

equivalent to the usual rite of laying on of hands, for the persons for whom this sin-offering is offered are those who are sentenced to exclusion from the camp. The offering as it were steps into their place, conducted thither by the priest. It is a beautiful picture of the voluntary character of the true atonement. There must be some reason why Eleazar is pointed out as the priest who is to officiate in the service. We think the reason to be that the service bears some resemblance to that of the Day of Atonement. On the Day of Atonement a comprehensive sin-offering is offered for all the other sins of the whole congregation. On this occasion a sin-offering is offered for potential impurities of a special kind throughout the congregation. The two occasions stand over against one another as peculiarly solemn and special in character, but the first is of course the greatest from every point of view. For each of these two occasions an individual priest is designated, for the Day of Atonement the high priest himself, and for this rite his eldest son.

And one shall slay her before his face, and Eleazar the priest shall take of her blood with his finger, and sprinkle of her blood toward the front of the tent of meeting seven times. The priest is here the officer of Jehovah, so that the slaying before his face is equivalent to the slaying before Jehovah of the regular sin-offerings. The emphasis also, as in all sin-offerings, lies upon the death of the victim, and the ritual of presentation of the blood follows as nearly as possible the full ritual of the sanctuary. We notice that as the offering is prospective in its reference, and the persons in the congregation for whom it is offered are as yet unknown, the actual slaying of the victim is undertaken neither by the priest nor the elders of the congregation, but by any convenient person.

And one shall burn the heifer in his sight ; her skin and her flesh, and her blood, with her dung, shall he burn ; and the priest shall take cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet, and cast it into the midst of the burning of the heifer. We remember that the whole carcasses of those sin-offerings some of the blood of which had been brought within the sanctuary, with the exception of the fat which was burnt as a sweet savour upon the altar, and the blood which was poured out at its base, were taken without the camp to a clean place and there burnt. The burning in those cases was, as we have seen, with the purpose of removing a most holy thing from risk of desecration. But in the present case there is no sweet savour burnt upon the altar, nor is there any pouring out of blood at its base, but the

whole carcass, with its fat and its blood, is committed to the flames. We notice, however, that certain things, the cedar-wood, hyssop, and scarlet are at the same time cast into the burning. If the cedar-wood represents the burning of the fat, and the scarlet the outpouring of the blood, which are both necessary parts of the sin-offering, we may say that in all essentials the ritual of sin-offerings is present. The addition of hyssop on this occasion may imply that the whole is for the purpose of future application. It is a promise that what is being done is in preparation for a work of purification, even though the persons to be purified are not yet apparent.¹ But the casting of these things into the burning of the heifer serves also to distinguish this burning from the burning of the remains of the regular sin-offering. That burning was to remove the sacred flesh from human contact, this is to conserve the offering for application to the impure. *A man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place; and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water for impurity; it is a sin-offering.*

And now we come to that which is at first sight in complete contradiction to the law of the sin-offering. We have seen that what remained of the flesh of the regular sin-offering was to be regarded as most holy, and imparting a character of holiness to everything which it touched. In the present case, on the contrary, we are told that *the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the even.* It is clear then that the priest concerned in this service has contracted defilement, and that the washing and bathing are not to guard a holy thing from profanation, but as an act of purification. The same conditions are imposed upon the man who burns the heifer, while even he who gathers the ashes and deposits them in a clean place must wash his clothes and remain unclean until the even. And when there is occasion to use the water with which the ashes are mingled, *he that sprinkleth the water for impurity shall wash his clothes, and he that toucheth the water for impurity shall be unclean until even.*² The insistence on the attachment of impurity to the heifer here is as marked as the former insistence upon the holiness of the sin-offerings. We believe the explanation to be that in the case of the red heifer the offering is exhibited

¹ Cf. verse 18.

² Verse 21.

as under the sentence of Jehovah. It is taken without the camp by the priest, and its ashes are laid up without the camp.¹ The sentence of condemnation which properly belongs to defiled men rests upon it, and they go free. The sin-offering is shown here as if it were unclean, though it is quite obvious that the uncleanness is not its own. We have seen that in itself it is without impurity, inherent or contracted, and its ashes are laid up in a clean place. But it goes without the camp and it remains without the camp, so that the defiled may not be excluded, but may be purified. A complementary truth to that which is emphasized in the ordinary ritual for sin-offering is here illustrated in the most striking and vivid manner. It is the truth which St. Paul has expressed in the words, *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us*; ² and again, *Him Who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf*.³

But if the sin-offering is here shown as bearing the condemnation and rejection of the sinner, it is also made plain that it is for the sake of the congregation of the children of Israel in their impurities, so that they may be cleansed and not cut off from Israel.⁴ The method by which the virtue of the sin-offering is applied to defiled persons is worthy of note. Living water is added to a portion of the ashes of the heifer, which represent the whole substitutionary offering,⁵ and a clean person is to apply the water by a sprinkler of hyssop, sprinkling the person to be cleansed on the third and on the seventh days of his defilement.⁶ He is then to wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and thus to become clean from all defilement at even. The continuance in a condition of partial defilement for seven days is parallel to the custom in the cases of leprosy or defilement by issues which we have considered already.⁷ But the unique circumstance in this law is the purification on the third day, upon which special emphasis is laid. *If he purify not himself the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean*.⁸ We believe that there is a reference here to the truth that the true Sin-offering would rise from the dead on the third day. We have to remember that contact with the dead is here used by the Divine Wisdom to symbolize contact with sin, which is the cause and occasion of death in men; and that exclusion from the camp is used to

¹ Verses 3, 9.² Gal. iii. 13.³ 2 Cor. v. 21.⁴ Verses 9, 13.⁵ Verse 17.⁶ Verses 12, 19.⁷ Num. vi. 9 seems to show that this period of defilement for the dead was already recognized.⁸ Verse 12.

symbolize the separation from God, which is the death of the spiritual nature of men. When, therefore, a man has contact with the dead, he is at once liable to exclusion from the camp. But this exclusion does not take place, the reason being that another is excluded in his stead. In the figure indeed that other appears as permanently excluded, but this presents a fatal unlikeness to the Person who is being represented, if uncorrected by some further regulation. Accordingly we find that in each case the contact with death which is borne by the substitute for the individual lasts until the third day. On the third day living water is put to the ashes (not the ashes to living water¹) and the virtue of One that died and is alive again is applied to the person who is defiled by the dead. The emphasis which is here laid upon the purification taking place on the third day may be compared with a similar emphasis in the law for the peace-offerings, of which we have already spoken at length.² The reason in both cases is the same; and according to these Scriptures, amongst others, the Lord rose from the dead on the third day.

Before leaving the subject of the last two sections, it is important to draw attention to certain significant actions of our Lord recorded in the Gospels. We read there that near to the gate of a city, and in the presence of much people, He touched the bier on which lay the body of a dead man, and afterwards raised him to life.³ Again He permitted contact with Himself by a woman afflicted with an inveterate issue, and caused her to declare in the presence of all the people for what cause she touched Him, and how she was healed immediately.⁴ Once again, He stretched out His hand, and touched a man full of leprosy, with the result that the leprosy departed from him. On this occasion He bade the healed man go to the priest, and offer for his cleansing, as Moses commanded, for a testimony of His powers to the whole body of priests and people.⁵ The significance of these actions, in the light of the Mosaic Law, is apparent. The Lord desired to declare Himself to be the fulfilment of that Law. So far from being defiled Himself by contact with the unclean, their contact with Him conveyed cleansing virtue⁶ to them. By this He showed that the offerings which conferred cleansing under the Mosaic Law find their fulfilment in Himself. We have seen that they were made like Him.

¹ Verse 17.⁴ *Ib.* VIII. 47.² Ch. XII. p. 219.⁵ *Ib.* V. 12-14.³ Luke VII. 11-14.⁶ *Ib.* VIII. 46.

4. THE MEAL-OFFERING OF JEALOUSY AND EXPIATION FOR AN UNKNOWN MURDERER'S CRIME.

The test of adultery which we find in the fifth chapter of Numbers is a unique instance of its kind. We may believe that it was provided, like so many of the Mosaic institutions, for the protection of women, and to exempt them from more cruel forms of ordeal. It must at all events have had a deterrent effect against adultery on the part of the wife, and ill-considered accusations by the husband. We are concerned, however, in this place not with the general subject, but only with the peculiar form of offering which is here appointed. It is described as *a minchah of jealousy, a minchah of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance*.¹ It is distinguished from the regular *minchah* by being of barley meal, that is of the cheapest kind of meal, instead of fine flour; neither was oil poured upon it, nor frankincense added to it. We remember that the true meal-offering signified the service of men, a memorial of which was burnt upon the altar as a sweet savour. In the same way this offering is symbolic of bringing into the presence of God the actions of the accused woman. She is under strong suspicion of having committed a breach of the laws of God, and so her offering is stripped of the symbols of a full-orbed life. The ritual for this offering is also impressive. The priest brings the woman before Jehovah. He takes holy water² in an earthen vessel, and puts into the water some dust taken from the tabernacle floor. The woman with her hair let loose, in token of mourning, and holding the symbol of her actions in her hands, hears the promise of her immunity if she is innocent, and assents to the curse upon herself if she is guilty. These curses are then written in a book, and blotted out into the water which had been prepared. The priest then receives from the woman the symbol of her actions, and, after presenting it to God for use in this solemn rite by the act of waving,³ he burns a handful upon the altar, making it ascend in smoke as a memorial to God. By this act the woman solemnly commits her cause to God, Who knows all, and the decision is taken out of the hands of men. The woman then drinks in the water laden with curses, remembering that God has promised by the mouth of His priest that it shall

¹ Num. v. 15.

² Can this refer to water taken from the laver, where it always stood for the ablutions of the priests? Cf. Exod. xxx. 28, 29. The priests washed at, not in the laver.

³ This act again distinguishes this offering from the regular meal-offering.

prove innocuous if she is innocent, but warned that the curse will assuredly fall if she is guilty. The law closes with a reiteration of both warning and promise.

It is instructive to compare with this a somewhat similar ordinance in the Book of Deuteronomy.¹ This ordinance applies when a man has been found murdered and the murderer cannot be discovered. Under these circumstances it is enacted that the town or village nearest to the spot where the murdered man is found shall be held responsible. The elders are then required to profess their innocence before God with a kind of expiatory offering, after which they are absolved from guilt. The similarity with the ordinance which we have just been considering resides only in the fact that in both cases investigation by men has proved unavailing, and the cause is brought before God. In the former case there is a doubt whether a crime has been committed at all, so that the woman's secret actions are symbolically presented to the eye of God, and His decision is invited by the accused person. This would satisfy the jealous suspicions of her accuser. In the latter case, however, there is no doubt that the crime has been committed. The only question is that of the person on whom the true responsibility for the crime rests. In the absence of evidence the nearest town to the place where the dead man was found is collectively responsible. If the elders of this town wish to clear themselves of guilt, mere protestations of innocence are insufficient. They must clear themselves before God, that is before the priests, whom God had chosen to be the judges. It is interesting to notice here again the prerogative of judgment *in every controversy and every stroke*² assigned to the priests. But a mere declaration of innocence, even before the representatives of Jehovah, is insufficient in itself to free from the guilt of the actual taking of a human life. There must be life for life. Accordingly a life is provided to be surrendered as atonement for the life which had been wrongly taken, and which is here called *innocent blood*.³ The elders involved are to provide *a heifer of the herd, which hath not been wrought with, and which hath not drawn in the yoke*. We see here the general lineaments of a sin-offering, the unpolluted suffering for the polluted. *And the elders of that city shall bring down the heifer unto a valley with running water,*⁴ *which is neither plowed nor sown, and shall break the heifer's neck there in the*

¹ Deut. xxi. 1-9.

² Cf. *Ib.* xvii. 8-13 and xxiv. 8.

³ *Ib.* xxi. 8.

⁴ Or, perhaps, more literally, "a never-failing brook"; the place indicated is a wild spot in the hills, a ravine with a brook.

valley. Here again there is a general likeness to the ritual of the sin-offering, inasmuch as the elders themselves slay the animal whose death is to free them from guilt. The heifer is brought to a spot undefiled by human hands, a provision which reminds us of the altar of earth or unhewn stone. The breaking of the neck instead of slaying with a knife so as to pour out the blood is peculiar.¹ The priests now draw near as the representatives of Jehovah, and in their presence *all the elders of that city, who are nearest unto the slain man, shall wash their hands over the heifer whose neck was broken in the valley*; and in their hearing the elders shall answer and say, *Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive, O Jehovah, Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of Thy people Israel. And in this way the blood shall be forgiven them.* The symbolic meaning of these rites is sufficiently clear; and the heifer over which the elders wash their hands of the guilt of the crime does in a real sense bear that guilt, and suffer for it, and so cause them to be forgiven. But it is a very imperfect form of sin-offering, and bears only some such distant relation to the regular sin-offering, as the meal-offering of jealousy bears to the true meal-offering.

5. THE OFFERINGS OF THE NAZIRITE.

The law concerning the Nazirites follows the law of the Test of Adultery,² and was probably given at the same time, although by a separate oracle. The law of the Nazirite is connected with the general regulation of the custom of making vows. The existence of this custom in the chosen family, as well as among surrounding nations, is shown in the history of Jacob, who vowed a vow at Bethel on the occasion of his flight to Haran.³ It is also implied in the law of the offerings,⁴ where we have already noted that it was customary for the Israelites to make a vow to offer an animal as a burnt-offering or as a sacrifice of peace-offerings. Other forms of special vows are regulated in a later oracle,⁵ where we find that not only beasts, whether fit for sacrifice or not, might form the subject of a special vow, but also houses and fields and even the persons of men, women, and children. In the last case the persons were to be redeemed by fixed payments, according to a graduated scale, while in cases of poverty the priest might make a special valuation. The vow of the Nazirite is a special case of the vowing of

¹ Cf. Exod. xiii. 13; Is. lxvi. 3.

² Gen. xxviii. 20

⁴ E.g. Lev. vii. 16.

² Num. vi.

⁵ *Ib.* xxvii.

persons. In this case a man or a woman made a special vow *to separate himself unto Jehovah*, to become in fact a *separated person* for a definite period of time. The word *Nazir* as referring to persons is used in Scripture before this time only in the prophecy of Jacob, where he speaks of his son Joseph as *him that was separate* from his brethren.¹ The reference is of course to the special work and office to which Joseph had been called in the Divine Providence; and it is of deep and special interest to notice that the first person to whom this name is given in Scripture is that signal type of Jesus Christ, Joseph, the Saviour of Egypt and of Israel. But it appears that it had been customary for a person to declare himself or herself specially separated to the service of Jehovah for a definite period, and that such a person during the time of the separation was known as *Nazir*, a separated man or woman.² The present oracle limits and defines the extent of such separation, and ordains certain ceremonies upon its completion.

The separation consisted in three ordinances which were to be observed. The first referred to a complete severance from wine, fermented or unfermented, and from eating anything that is made of the grape-vine. It is plain from the prohibition being extended to the fruit of the vine, that abstinence from intoxicants is not the point of the prohibition. We believe that the ordinance is merely an outward and visible sign of separation from the ordinary life of men. The Nazirite is prohibited one of the three staples of Israelite diet. It is a vivid picture of the man who is consecrated to God using the world indeed, but not using it to the full.³ The second prohibition allows no razor to come upon the head of the Nazirite, until the days are fulfilled in which he separates himself to Jehovah. This seems to be the prominent characteristic of the Nazirite,⁴ no doubt because it was always present to the eye, which was not the case of course with peculiarities of diet, or with the third prohibition which we shall next consider. The untrimmed locks of the Nazirite are *the head of his separation*,⁵ and at the close of the days of his separation they are shaved off and laid upon the altar. They are particularly the sign of a continual separation to Jehovah; in every moment, waking or sleeping, working or

¹ Gen. XLIX. 26. In Lev. XXV. 5, *II undressed vine* represents the same word, the vine being in the sabbatical and jubilee years separated from ordinary use.

² From *nazar*, to separate; compare the use of this verb in Lev. XV. 31; XXII. 2; Ezek. XIV. 7; Hos. IX. 10; Zech. VII. 3.

³ I Cor. VII. 31.

⁴ I Sam. I. 11; Judges XIII. 5; XVI. 17.

⁵ Verses 9, 18.

resting, this mark of separation is present. This is a plain parable of those whose life is one continuous expectation and hope, that Christ shall *always* be magnified in their body, whether by living or by dying.¹ The third injunction regards separation from defilement by a dead body. The Nazirite, during the days when *his separation unto God is upon his head*, is not allowed contact even with the dead bodies of father or mother, brother or sister. The claims of his God upon this separated man take precedence even of the claims of father and mother, brother or sister. The regulation is in exact accordance with the assertion of our Lord, *He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me.*² These regulations define the terms of a special vow of separation to Jehovah. It may well be that there was special need for *limiting* the outward expression of separation to these three particulars. But with regard to this we need not enquire or speculate, only calling attention to the fact that neither here nor in the New Testament is there any precedent for special vows of celibacy or chastity. The omission of any such regulation for a separated man or woman under the Mosaic law is all the more remarkable, because avoidance of uncleanness by the dead is especially emphasized, while those allied forms of ceremonial uncleanness are deliberately passed by in the law of his ceremonial separation. It would have been well for the Christian Church if it had been guided in this matter by the wisdom of God, rather than by suggestions which St. Paul declares to have their origin in seducing spirits.³ But this is a digression which we do not intend to pursue. We have pointed out what we believe to be the spiritual significance of the three marks of separation of the Nazirite. But we must not omit to notice how these obligations appear to be related to the perpetual obligations of the priesthood, and indeed in a special manner to those of the high priest. This is most clearly marked in the obligation of the Nazirite to abstain from all contact with dead bodies. The same rule was incumbent upon the priests, but with an exception in the case of the dead bodies of parents, brothers, and sisters.⁴ The rule of separation for the Nazirite, however, extends even to these, and is thus identical with the obligation of the high priest, who is not to let the hair of his head go loose, nor rend his clothes, nor go in to any dead body, even to that of his father or his mother.⁵ But even in

¹ Phil. i. 20.² Matt. x. 37.³ I Tim. iv. 1-5.⁴ And also of children, Lev. xxi. 1-4.⁵ *Ib.* 10, 11.

the first prohibition of the Nazirite law we can observe a likeness to a rule of the priesthood. He is separated by that prohibition from a portion of the ordinary food of the people, and we find that in the same way special dietary rules were in force for the priests. It is distinctly implied on more than one occasion that the ordinary people might eat the flesh of clean animals which had died, or had been torn by beasts, with no more penalty than ceremonial uncleanness lasting until evening, and a ceremonial ablution.¹ But similar freedom was not allowed to the priests.² The same principle underlies the two regulations, namely, that the separated man, be he priest or Nazirite, is under special obligations of restraint in the use of the things of the world. In the second obligation of the Nazirite again we find a very striking parallelism to the rules for the priesthood. It was a general rule for all the Israelites that they were not to round the corners of their heads, nor mar the corners of their beard,³ no doubt with the idea of separation from the customs of neighbouring nations, whether the customs had a religious significance or were merely national.⁴ The shaving of the head or beard, on the contrary, appears to have been allowed, but not to the priests. Of the priests we read, *they shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of their beard*,⁵ which seems to be explained by Ezekiel when he writes of the priests in the Temple he is describing, *neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long, they shall only cut off the hair of their heads*.⁶ The carefully kept hair of the priests was then a sign of their separation to God, as the uncut hair of the Nazirite was a sign of his separation. But if the words of Ezekiel correctly reproduce the custom of the tabernacle, we see that the long hair of the Nazirite distinguished him from the ordinary priests, no less than it marked him out as a man separated to God. And here it is of special importance to note that the word which is used for his long hair as a sign of separation is precisely the word which is used of the golden plate upon the mitre of the high priest, and of the consecrating oil which was poured upon his head. The golden plate is called "the holy crown,"⁷ and in the special regulations for preserving the high priest from ceremonial defilement the reason is given that "the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him".⁸ The word for which "crown" in

¹ Lev. vii. 24; xi. 40; xvii. 15.² *Ib.* xix. 27.⁴ Jer. ix. 26.⁶ Ezek. xliv. 20.⁷ Exod. xxix. 6.² *Ib.* xxii. 8.⁵ Lev. xxi. 5.⁸ Lev. xxi. 12.

these two places stands is in the original *nezer*, which means literally "separation," being derived from the same root as *nazir*, "a separated man"; and it is the same word which is applied in the law which we are considering to the hair of the Nazirite, where we read that on the completion of his vow he is to *shave his separation*.¹ The long hair of the Nazirite is then the distinguishing mark of a separation to God, which is modelled upon the high sanctity and lifelong separation of the high priest. But we have seen that the high priest in this whole system is made like the Son of God, so that the law of the Nazirite is made to correspond with the truth of the Gospel, that we who are sanctified are to be followers of Christ in being holy, guileless, undefiled, and separated from sin.²

The offerings which are appointed upon the completion of the Nazirite vow are full of significance. They show unmistakably that the man who separates himself to Jehovah, so far from putting Jehovah in his debt, is on the other hand most deeply indebted to Jehovah. A sin-offering, a burnt-offering, and a sacrifice of peace-offerings with the three kinds of unleavened bread and cakes for the feast that followed it, together with the appropriate meal- and drink-offerings, were all provided. These were, no doubt, offered in the regular order, first the sin-offering, next the burnt-offering with its meal- and drink-offering; finally the sacrifice of peace-offerings with its meal- and drink-offerings. This ritual must have impressed upon the Nazirite the privileges of separation to God. He was shown that his admission for a time to a position of nearness to God, comparable to that of the high priest himself, depended upon the atonement and consecration wrought out by a substitute, and upon a fellowship with God established through it. He was reminded that though the days of his special vow of consecration were fulfilled, his own position and standing before God,³ and the claims of God upon himself,⁴ remained exactly the same as before, and in no way different from those of any other Israelite, who had not vowed as he had done. All this we need not explain; it is obviously true to the spiritual realities of the relationship of men with God.

The close of the Nazirite's period of separation is marked by a few but significant rites. After the offerings are over, and before he enjoys the feast of fellowship with God, the

¹ Num. vi. 19. The later use of this word as applied to a regal crown (2 Sam. i. 10 al.) is accounted for by its being the sign of separation to the regal office.

² Heb. vii. 26.

³ The substitutionary offerings.

⁴ The meal- and drink-offerings.

✓ Nazirite removes by shaving the mark of his separation, and places it upon the altar fires, where the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings is still burning. This is a priestly act, and we know no other occasion where a layman places anything upon the altar fires. Then the Nazirite receives from the hands of the priest the shoulder of the ram of peace-offerings, and one of each of the cakes, and holds them in his hands. At that moment the Nazirite must have felt himself to be a priest. The act was reminiscent of the service of induction of the priesthood, when Moses took the fat, and the right thigh of the ram of consecration, together with the cakes, and put all upon the hands of Aaron and of his sons that they might feel as it were in their hands the office of the priesthood. But while the likeness is real, and is intended, the contrast between the two rites is equally marked. We have shown in a former chapter that this rite at the consecration of Aaron coupled with his eating of the flesh in the court of the tabernacle was indicative of the fact that he had something to offer in his mediatorial work, and that that something was himself. If, then the Nazirite had done the same thing in the same way it must have had the same significance; but this would have been untrue to the spiritual realities which we have seen to be ever present, and guiding the ritual. Accordingly we find several differences which serve to distinguish the action of the Nazirite from that of the high priest, such, for example, as that the fat of the ram was placed in Aaron's hands, but not in the hands of the Nazirite. Again, the right thigh of the ram is given to Aaron, but the boiled shoulder to the Nazirite. We have seen in the chapter on the sacrifice of peace-offerings that the shoulder is merely the perquisite of the priest out of each such sacrifice, and is distinguished from the breast and thigh. Once more it is made quite clear at the consecration of Aaron that the waving was performed by Moses while the various objects remained in the hands of Aaron.¹ In the case of the Nazirite the priest probably took these objects from his hands before waving them, but of this we cannot feel certain from the text.² Lastly there is no stipulation that the Nazirite shall eat the flesh of his offering in the court of the tabernacle as was the case with the priests. On the whole, then, although there is a general likeness between the two ritual acts, they are at the same time markedly distinguished. We believe that the object of the ritual in the case of the Nazirite, after he had

¹Exod. xxix. 24, 25.²Num. vi. 19, 20.

shaven the head of his separation, was to remind him of the near relation in which he had stood to Jehovah during the days of his separation, and to assure him that although the days of his vow were completed, and he stood once more in the place of an ordinary Israelite, that place itself implied membership in a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.¹ In this way the Nazirites as well as the prophets were a witness to God and to His claims.²

It is interesting to recall the fact that we read in the Acts of four Jewish believers who took upon themselves the Nazirite vow, and that St. Paul helped them to defray the charges of these considerable offerings, and was present with them during the service.³

It only remains to notice briefly the provision made in case a Nazirite was accidentally defiled by the dead during the days of his separation. This defilement was to last seven days, at the end of which time the mark of his separation must be removed by shaving, and all the previous days of separation be regarded as lost. The Nazirite was also to bring a sin-offering and a burnt-offering of birds on the eighth day, to hallow his head for a fresh beginning of separation to Jehovah; and he was to offer at the same time a trespass-offering for his accidental defilement. It seems that at this time the ordinance of the water for impurity for defilement by the dead had not yet been given, and the ceremony of purification accordingly followed the rule of purification after other ceremonial defilements,⁴ and thereafter remained special in the case of the Nazirite. The offering of a trespass-offering is, no doubt, on account of the accidental contact of the Nazirite with the dead, and seems to be just such a case of "doing a thing which Jehovah had commanded not to be done" as is contemplated in the law of the trespass-offering, where a ram was to be offered, without any money payment.⁵ It is possible that there is no particular significance in this provision further than to emphasize the fact that in making a vow of separation the Nazirite was in no sense making God his debtor. On the contrary it involved the Nazirite in obligations, even the accidental breaking of which called for atonement by substitutionary offerings, and an entirely fresh beginning. But it is more probable that we have here also an illustration of the spiritual truth that *when the righteous man turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, none of his righteous deeds that he hath done*

¹ Exod. xix. 6.

² Amos ii. ii, 12.

³ Acts xxi. 23, 24.

⁴ Lev. xv. 13-15 and 28-30.

⁵ *Ib.* v. 17-19.

*shall be remembered ; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die.*¹ And indeed the whole law of the Nazirite in the day of the completion of his separation reminds us of that saying of the Lord, *Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants ; we have done that which it was our duty to do.*²

It is of interest to remark that we have three instances of Nazirites in the Old Testament records. The first is that of the mother of Samson, who was commanded to observe the Nazirite vow until her wonderful son was born.³ The next is Samson himself, who was thus a *Nazirite unto God from the womb*,⁴ and who, it is implied, would be a Saviour of Israel as long as he observed his vow. How sadly he threw away his high office and privileges there is no need here to recount. The third instance is that of Samuel, the son asked of God, whom his mother vowed that she would *give unto Jehovah all the days of his life, and there should no razor come upon his head.*⁵ Faithfully this pious mother kept her promise, and nobly through his long life her son accepted his mother's vow, and fulfilled it. It is generally assumed that the direction to Zechariah that his son John the Baptist was to *drink no wine nor strong drink* implies that he was to be a Nazirite for life,⁶ and this seems to be the meaning of the words. If so, it is remarkable that the first member and the last of the continuous line of prophets who prepared the coming of the Christ⁷ were both of them men consecrated by a lifelong separation to Jehovah ; and in this way the whole order of the prophets is connected with the institution of the priesthood in a common likeness to the Son of God.

6. OFFERINGS ON FESTAL OCCASIONS.

It seems to be part of the Divine economy that men should observe the recurrence of natural seasons.⁸ And very early in the history of the human race we read of "seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night,"⁹ as alternations already well-marked in the minds of men. It was then in accordance with a divinely implanted human instinct that the children of Israel were directed to observe the month and the day in which they came out of Egypt.¹⁰

¹ Ezek. XVIII. 24.

² Luke XVII. 10.

³ Judges XIII. 13, 14.

⁴ *Ib.* verse 5.

⁵ 1 Sam. I. 11.

⁶ Luke I. 15.

⁷ Acts III. 24.

⁸ Gen. I. 14.

⁹ *Ib.* VIII. 22.

¹⁰ Exod. XIII. 3.

When they reached Mount Sinai the keeping of a feast to Jehovah three times in the year formed part of the ordinances of the covenant.¹ The first of these is the Feast of the Passover followed by the seven days of Unleavened Bread, which had already been instituted at the departure from Egypt. The dates of the other two are connected with the natural seasons of harvest, and of the final ingathering at the end of the year, but are not at this time further defined. On the renewal of the covenant some three months later, the second of these feasts is called "the feast of weeks,"² but the meaning of this term is still undefined. It is not until a somewhat later date, when the tabernacle had been completed, and probably during the first month of the second year of the exodus, that the full system of *appointed seasons*³ was made known. It now appears that the three feasts⁴ form part of a complete series of special seasons. The appointed seasons are then as follows:—

1. The Sabbath is kept on every seventh day, and no manner of work done on this day.
2. The 14th day of the first month is the Passover.
The seven days following, from the 15th to the 21st inclusive, is the Feast of Unleavened Bread; and on the first and last days of this feast all servile work is prohibited. On the second day of unleavened bread the first sheaf of the barley harvest is waved.
3. From the day on which the barley-sheaf is waved, and inclusive of this day, seven complete weeks are reckoned, and the next or fiftieth day is the Feast of the First-fruits of wheat harvest,⁵ or as it is otherwise called, the Feast of Weeks.⁶ In the New Testament it is spoken of as the Feast of Pentecost, Pentecost being the Greek for fifty. This day is also distinguished by abstinence from servile work.
4. The seventh month is marked by special solemnities.
On the first day of the month there is a memorial of blowing of trumpets, with cessation from servile work.
On the tenth day of the month is the Day of Atonement.
The seven days from the 15th to the 21st days of the month, both inclusive, are the Feast of Tabernacles, the first day being marked by abstinence from servile work. The eighth day of this feast closes the

¹ Exod. xxiii. 14-17.

³ Heb. *mo'ed*; R.V. "set-feasts," Lev. xxiii.

⁴ Heb. *chag*.

² *Ib.* xxxiv. 22.

⁶ *Ib.*

⁵ Exod. xxxiv. 22.

whole series of appointed seasons with another sacred day on which no servile work is done.

It is worthy of notice that the first day of each month was also observed by a blowing of the silver trumpets,¹ but this is not included in the present series, because it was not marked as a day of holy convocation, nor does it form part of the septenary system, which is so clearly marked in these appointed seasons. The number seven is evidently stamped upon the whole, in the hallowing of each seventh day, the seven days of unleavened bread, and the seven weeks to the Feast of Weeks, the special observances of the seventh month, and the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles. This system is still further developed in a second oracle,² given at about the same time, in which the hallowing of every seventh year, and of the year which followed seven Sabbaths of years, is ordained.

For all the annual appointed seasons, including the new moons of each month, special offerings are appointed, and these we must now describe.

We first of all draw attention, however, to the fact that each of the three feasts is connected both with the natural seasons and also with the historical deliverance from Egypt. This is an arrangement by which existing institutions might become purified from superstitious observances,³ and made to serve the cause of pure religion. Thus the ordinance for the Feast of Passover and Unleavened Bread recalled the incidents of the exodus, and also gave opportunity for the offering of the first-fruits of barley harvest. The Feast of Weeks according to Jewish tradition, which gains strong confirmation from the records themselves, was the anniversary of the descent of Jehovah upon Mount Sinai, the utterance of the Ten Words, and the delivery of the words of the Covenant. It synchronized also with the end of the corn harvest. The Feast of Tabernacles at the end of the civil year, and when the ingathering of the fruits was completed, was made reminiscent of the exodus by the command to dwell in booths during the days of the feast. In this way the Lord of Redemption is identified with the Lord of Creation, and the blessings of this life are linked with the inestimable blessings obtained by bloodshedding; for the whole series of observances of natural seasons springs directly from the commemoration of a historical event at the Passover.⁴ We must not omit to notice also that the

¹ Num. x. 10.

² Lev. xxv.

³ Such, for example, as seem to be referred to in Exod. xxiii. 19.

⁴ Cf. Gen. viii. 20-22.

whole is ruled by the primeval institution of the Sabbath. We believe that the observance of the seventh day in some special manner is as old as the human race; and that it is the memorial of the fact that God created men upon the earth to enjoy His blessing in their consecration to His service. This we believe to be the meaning of the phrase in the primeval record that *God rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made; and God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.* This blessing of God men forfeited at the fall, but the observance of the seventh day is a memorial of the original purpose, and a promise of its ultimate fulfilment.

This promise, as we know, is to be fulfilled in Christ, and looks forward to the rest which remains for the people of God.¹ We may then expect that the other appointed seasons, the very warp and woof of which is this same Sabbatic observance, bear also a reference to Christ; and this presumption is turned into a certainty of conviction, when we remember that the historical events to which these observances looked back are themselves sign-posts pointing forwards, and true pictures of the redemption wrought by Christ, and of all the good things to come. The special offerings therefore connected with these appointed seasons we may expect to be adapted to the truths of the Gospel of Christ.

It is interesting to notice that a special fire-offering is appointed for certain of these seasons,² and is implied for them all,³ but the form which it is to take is not specified at the time. The observance of this system of festal occasions is obviously intended to begin with the entry of the people into the promised land, and indeed this is expressly stated.⁴ Detailed regulations for the fire-offerings are therefore postponed, and on account of the rebellion of the children of Israel, and their consequent wandering in the wilderness, they were not given until forty years later, and very shortly before the death of Moses.⁵

The special fire-offerings for the appointed seasons will be best exhibited in the form of a table. All these offerings, it will be remembered, are in addition to the burnt-offering of a lamb, with its appropriate meal- and drink-offering, every morning and every evening, continually without fail throughout the year. This ordinance is put in the forefront of the fire-offerings for the seasons,⁶ in order to emphasize the truth that these fire-offerings bear no new significance, but are

¹ Heb. iv.² Lev. xxiii. 8, 25, 36.³ *Ib.* verse 37.⁴ *Ib.* verse 10.⁵ Num. xxviii.-xxix.⁶ *Ib.* xxviii. 3-8.

simply an enlarged representation, so to speak, of an ever-present fact. We need find no significance in the numbers of the various offerings, beyond the desire to emphasize the dependence of the Israelite for life and breath and all things, for his redemption from Egypt, his salvation in the wilderness journey, and his final rest in Canaan, upon the substitutionary offerings made in his behalf, and upon his own continuance in the service of God. This truth was continually exhibited in the tabernacle service, it was made to shine out brightly on every festal season of the year.

TABLE OF OFFERINGS AT SPECIAL SEASONS.

Season.	Burnt-offering.			Sin-offering. He-goats
	Young bullocks.	Rams	He-lambs a year old.	
Sabbath Day	—	—	2	—
New moon	2	1	7	1 (monthly)
Feast of Unleavened Bread	2	1	7	1 (daily for seven days)
Feast of Weeks	2	1	7	1
Seventh month 1st day	1	1	7	1
10th day	1	1	7	1
Feast of Tabernacles 15th day	13	2	14	1
16th	12	2	14	1
17th	11	2	14	1
18th	10	2	14	1
19th	9	2	14	1
20th	8	2	14	1
21st	7	2	14	1
22nd	1	1	7	1 (on the eighth day)

In connection with all these burnt-offerings the standard meal- and drink-offerings¹ were presented with each animal. It is evident that the crowning festival of the year is distinguished by the largest exhibition of the substitutionary system, and at the same time, as always, by the largest expression of human devotion. This seems to answer to the spiritual truth that the growth in our conception of the work which Christ has done for us claims a fuller consecration of our lives to His service.

We must not omit to notice the steady persistence of the single goat for a sin-offering throughout the series; for it is the atoning blood of Christ which lies at the base of the altar of His burnt-offering.

We remark, in passing, that this multiplication of offerings at various appointed seasons may have afforded a precedent for the large number of burnt-offerings which were offered in later times upon special occasions. Thus we read of three thousand animals offered by David at Jerusalem,² and of the

¹ Ch. xvi. p. 298.² 1 Chron. xxix, 21.

thousand burnt-offerings offered by Solomon upon the altar at Gibeon.¹ At the same time we feel that this was a departure from the simplicity of the ancient ritual. The action of Hezekiah in offering a burnt-offering of seven bullocks, seven rams, and seven lambs,² and a sin-offering of seven he-goats, for all Israel, on the great occasion of his restoration of the temple worship, seems more in accordance with Divine precedent.³ At that time the people brought of their own free will seventy bullocks, a hundred rams, and two hundred lambs for a burnt-offering.⁴ But this is an accumulation of individual offerings, rather than a large collective burnt-offering. The large number of sacrifices, that is sacrifices of peace-offerings, which we read of on several occasions, need not surprise us; because these were no doubt the offerings for a large number of individuals.⁵ We think that this is the probable explanation of the enormous number of sacrifices offered at the dedication of Solomon's Temple, namely 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep.⁶ The sacrifice is indeed spoken of as made by Solomon, but this is no doubt to be understood in the sense of the preceding verse, that *the king and all Israel with him offered sacrifice before Jehovah*. And it is expressly stated that Solomon *held the feast at that time, and all Israel with him, a great assembly, from the entrance of Hamath unto the brook of Egypt, before Jehovah our God, seven days and seven days, even fourteen days. On the eighth day he sent the people away; and they blessed the king and went unto their tents joyful and glad of heart*. It is clear then that this very large number of sacrifices was provided, either by royal bounty,⁷ or by the people themselves, or by both means, to supply the festal needs of a very great assembly for fourteen days. The number is not excessive for such a purpose as this; meanwhile we notice that the ordinary altar arrangements, as we might expect, were not sufficient for such a large number of sacrifices, so that the middle of the court which was before the house of Jehovah was sanctified, and served temporarily as an altar of burnt-offering. This may have formed a precedent for future occasions. It seems to have been thoroughly understood by the Israelites that while careless disregard of ritual, as in the case of Nadab and Abihu, or impious presumption, like that of Uzziah, were to be repro-

¹ 1 Kings III. 4.

² Cf. a similar number of *zevachim* offered by David on a special occasion, 1 Chron. xv. 26.

³ 2 Chron. XXIX. 20-24.

⁴ *Ib.* verses 31-34.

⁵ E.g. 1 Chron. XXIX. 21; 2 Chron. xv. 11; XXIX. 31.

⁶ 1 Kings VIII. 63-66; 2 Chron. VII. 4-7.

⁷ Cf. *Ib.* XXX. 24.

bated, yet a certain adaptation of sacrificial rules or of other ceremonies to special or to altered circumstances was not displeasing to God.¹

Before leaving this part of our subject we draw attention to a difficulty which seems to call for some comment. The offerings at the appointed feasts are summarized as "an offering made by fire unto Jehovah, a burnt-offering, and a meal-offering, *a sacrifice* (*zevach*), and drink-offerings, each on its own day."² The difficulty lies in the words "a sacrifice," for no sacrifice of peace-offerings is *appointed* for these days, although they might be voluntarily offered. We suspect a corruption in the text, both on account of the fact that no sacrifice is appointed, and also because the words are inserted very awkwardly between the meal-offering and the drink-offerings. The supposition that our present Hebrew text is here faulty is strengthened by the rendering of the LXX translators. The verse runs thus in the Greek translation. "These are feasts to the Lord, which ye shall call holy convocations to offer offerings (*καρπώματα*) to the Lord, whole-burnt-offerings (*όλοκαυτώματα*) and their meal-offerings (*θυσίας*) and their drink-offerings, that for each day on its day." The "sacrifice" of our English version has here disappeared, and the summary agrees with the facts as recorded in Numbers.

We have digressed somewhat from our main theme to notice an allied subject, and explain a slight difficulty. We now recall the fact which we have considered above, that on each appointed season which marked the passage of time, or was connected with the revolution of the seasons, and with the redemption, salvation, and introduction of the Israelite into Canaan, the truth of his absolute dependence upon substitutionary offerings is brought into special prominence, and along with it the claim which these mercies make upon him for the dedication of all his activities to God.

But we have already reminded ourselves that the redemption, salvation, and introduction into Canaan of which some of these appointed seasons are memorials are themselves pictures of the salvation which is in Christ Jesus. And the whole system of "appointed seasons" is permeated with the promise of the rest that remaineth for the people of God. So that from more than one point of view we are prepared to see in the ordinances which marked those feasts and appointed seasons some likeness to the work of Christ. To these we must now turn our attention.

¹ See e.g. 2 Chron. xxx. 2, 17-20.

² Lev. xxiii. 37.

We need not again point out the correspondence of the ritual of the Passover with the truths of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus,¹ nor that of the Feast of Unleavened Bread with the claim upon the redeemed to forsake sin. But on the morrow after the first day of unleavened bread, which was observed as a partial Sabbath by abstinence from all servile work, a remarkable ceremony took place. On this day the first-fruits of the harvest was presented to Jehovah by waving a sheaf of barley, with the accompaniment of a special burnt-offering of a he-lamb of a year old, together with a meal-offering of double the standard quantity (two tenth parts of an ephah instead of one tenth part), and a drink-offering of the regular amount (one fourth of a hin). There can be no doubt that the burnt-offering offered with these first-fruits is a fresh reminder that seedtime and harvest succeed one another in due rotation only on account of the reconciliation which Another has made for us,² a truth which is plainly enunciated in the history of the burnt-offering of Noah.³ The meal- and drink-offering are as ever connected with the substitutionary burnt-offering in token that men are saved to serve. It is not easy at once to see the reason for a doubled meal-offering on the present occasion. We have noticed a similar variation in the offerings for cleansing of a leper, and have endeavoured to account for it there.⁴ In the present case the two tenths are both connected with the he-lamb, and neither of them with the wave-sheaf, so that it seems to be a clear instance of a doubled meal-offering. We think that the explanation may be that on the first occasion of offering first-fruits of men's labour in the cultivation of the soil, that particular offering which is symbolic of all their activities is brought into special prominence. Meanwhile the amount of the drink-offering is not increased, a peculiarity which we find it difficult to account for, unless it be because the labour of men in the grain fields rather than in the vineyard is specially in view at the time. But this suggestion does not seem to meet the difficulty, both because it narrows the significance of the meal-offering to a specific part of the labours of men, and also because it does not account for the increase of the oil which was mingled with the flour, and which must have increased in proportion with it. We leave this difficulty then unsolved. But we may well ask why the wave-sheaf, the first-fruits of all the harvest, is to be offered precisely on this day, *on the morrow after the Sabbath*,

¹ See ch. III. p. 28.

³ Gen. VIII. 20-22.

² Lev. XXIII. 14.

⁴ Above, p. 319.

that is to say on the morrow after the first day of unleavened bread, which itself immediately followed the day of the pass-over. The answer is simple and decided. This wave-sheaf is made like Christ, just as the passover Lamb was made like Him. The passover sacrifice is a true sacrifice of peace-offerings, and we have seen that the truth that Christ should rise from the dead on the third day is specially emphasized in the law of peace-offerings.¹ But this truth finds no place in the passover ritual standing alone; therefore it is ordained that on the third day after the slaying of the passover a sheaf of grain shall be presented in the Temple. Grain in the ear is the constant symbol of life from death, so that we have here a true and beautiful picture of the truth that Christ our Passover having been sacrificed for us rose again from the dead on the third day. And not only so, but that He rose again in His proper order, as the first-fruits of a future harvest, and the pledge of a blessed hope that all those who are Christ's shall be raised from the dead at His coming.²

We come next to the Feast of Weeks, the fiftieth day from that on which the wave-sheaf was offered before Jehovah. By this time the grain harvest was completed, and a new meal-offering is presented as first-fruits. This takes the form of two wave-loaves, each made of one tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, baked like the ordinary food of the people with leaven. The burnt-offering which is to accompany this offering of first-fruits is a specially large one, consisting of no less than one young bullock, two rams, and seven lambs, with their standard quantity of meal- and drink-offerings. The significance of this burnt-offering we take to be the same as in other similar cases. The major portion of the fruits of the earth had now been gathered in, and with the recollection of larger blessings there is required a larger representation of that offering on which the whole depends, and an acknowledgment on a larger scale of the claims which that offering makes upon men. But the form in which the first-fruits is offered is here significantly changed. It is no longer a sheaf of ears, but loaves baked with leaven. The picture is no longer that of resurrection from the dead, but rather of the table and home of the people. And a true picture of those tables and homes cannot, alas! be free from leaven; for in no home of men upon earth is there complete freedom from the corruption of sin. But, we notice, a he-goat for a sin-offering, and two he-lambs

¹ Ch. xii. p. 219.

² 1 Cor. xv. 20-23.

a year old for a sacrifice of peace-offerings, are to be presented with the wave-loaves. These it is which secure their acceptance and which emphasize their true meaning. The sin-offering no doubt is added here on account of the presence of leaven in the wave-loaves. The two he-lambs for a sacrifice of peace-offerings are a reminder that Jehovah Himself is present at the tables and in the homes of which the two loaves are the symbol, just as through the true Sacrifice of Peace-offerings, although we are still burdened with the corruption of the flesh, we nevertheless enjoy the fellowship and blessing of God and of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord in life and in labour. We recollect that it was only *when the Day of Pentecost was fully come* that the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles for their work of testimony, and that upon that day the first-fruits of the true but imperfect Church of Christ was gathered in. To this fact of Gospel history we believe the ordinance of the Feast of Weeks to be adapted. This prophetic reference of the Feast of First-fruits may account for the special form of the offering on this occasion, as compared with the offering of first-fruits at the Feast of Unleavened Bread. There are two loaves instead of a single sheaf, because the reference is no longer to one Person but to many; and they are loaves, not sheaves, because the persons represented are not viewed as risen from the dead, nor as being in themselves the seeds of a future harvest, but rather as being united into one body.¹

On the first day of the seventh month, besides the regular offerings for each new moon, which we have already noticed, there was a partial Sabbath in abstinence from servile work, and also a *memorial of blowing-of-trumpets*. The word in the original here rendered "blowing-of-trumpets" is used of any loud sound.² In the present case it denotes the blast of the two silver trumpets which were afterwards ordered to be made, and which were blown over all offerings made at the appointed feasts and at the beginnings of months, whether the regular offerings or private sacrifices, *for a memorial before your God*.³

On the tenth day of the month was the great Day of Atonement, the significance of which we have already considered at length.

From the fifteenth to the twenty-first days of this month the Feast of Tabernacles was kept for seven days with great joy,

¹ 1 Cor. x. 17.

² Num. x. 6, *an alarm*; Lev. xxv. 9, the *loud trumpet*; 1 Sam. iv. 5, *shout*.

³ Num. x. 10; cf. Ps. xxvii. 6, *marg*; Ps. lxxxli. 3.

the whole fruits of the land, its oil and its wine, as well as its grain harvest, having been finally gathered in. The people dwelt in booths in grateful memory of the wanderings long since past; they saw before their eyes every day in the large offerings a picture of the foundation on which their happiness rested; and in this manner the appointed seasons of the year were brought to a close. On the eighth day was a solemn assembly with freedom from servile work, typical of a new beginning, and a fresh year begun with God, resting on the same foundations, and inspired by the same motives as of old.

Now it is certainly remarkable that while the Feast of the Passover and the Feast of Weeks find a plain fulfilment in the facts of the Gospel History, the Feast of Tabernacles does not correspond to anything in that history. The probability is that this Feast points on to what is future still, and will be fulfilled only when all the "fruits of the land" have been gathered in, at the end of the present age.

If this is so, then it is probable that the Blowing of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement will also be found to correspond to some events in the future. We have seen in a former chapter that the ritual of the Day of Atonement presents a remarkable picture of the work of Christ in atoning for and in removing sin. But it is noticeable that in its place in the scheme of appointed seasons¹ it is not the work of the High Priest on this day, but rather the necessity for a complete cessation from all work, and for the affliction of their souls by fasting, which is impressed upon the people. We are not to imagine that any further work of atonement remains to be effected, but it is possible that some deep humiliation and intense Sabbatism in view of the great Atonement is yet to be experienced in the world. And if so, the preliminary blowing of trumpets may also have some special prophetic significance. We leave these questions to the consideration of the reader in the light of the prophetic Scriptures.

It only remains to draw attention to the sabbatical and jubilee years,² which are the call and the promise of the weekly Sabbath writ large. And in this view of the matter the regulation that the Year of Jubilee shall begin from the Day of Atonement is of the deepest significance. When seven sabbaths of years are complete, *then shalt thou send abroad the loud trumpet* ("the *shophar* of loud sound") *on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye send abroad the trumpet throughout all your land.*³ From this

¹ Lev. XXIII. 26-32.

² *Ib.* XXV.

³ *Ib.* 9.

loud sound with which the fiftieth year was ushered in it gained its name of Jubilee.¹ The word *yovel* is used of the loud blast which was heard upon Mount Sinai,² and of the blasts of the trumpets at the encompassing of Jericho, the "trumpets of rams' horns" of our version being literally "jubilee trumpets".³ It does not occur elsewhere in Scripture, except as the name of the fiftieth year.⁴ It is evident that we are intended to connect the whole year with the loud trumpet of the Day of Atonement. The special features of the year thus ushered in are summarized as follows: *Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you; ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it of the undressed vines. For it is a jubilee; it shall be holy unto you; ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.*⁵ This then is the goal to which the Sabbaths, whether of days or of years, constantly tend. It is made possible by a solemn act of atonement, it is ushered in by the great sound of a trumpet, it is marked by liberty, by recovery, by reunion, by rest. Is it then the case that the promises, in Christ and through His atonement, of the Gospel, which speak of a glorious liberty of the children of God,⁶ of times of refreshing,⁷ and restoration,⁸ and regeneration;⁹ of gathering together unto Christ, of union and reunion in His presence,¹⁰ and of a rest which remains for His people,¹¹ are consciously borrowed from the language of the ancient Jubilee? Or must we not rather conclude that this institution of the Law was made like these good things to come? And is it coincidence or is it design that this glad year of the Old Covenant is ushered in by a loud trumpet, even as in the promise of the New Covenant liberty from the bondage of corruption, and recovery, and reunion, and rest, are all to come when a great trumpet shall sound?¹²

¹ Heb. *yovel*.

² Exod. xix. 13, "trumpet" in the original is "*yovel*".

³ Josh. vi. 4, 6, 8, 13; so in verse 5, "the ram's horn" is "the jubilee horn".

⁴ In Lev. xxv. and xxvii. *passim*; and in Num. xxxvi. 4.

⁵ Lev. xxv. 10-12.

⁶ Rom. viii. 21.

⁷ 2 Thess. i. 7.

⁸ Acts iii. 21.

⁹ Matt. xix. 28.

¹⁰ 2 Thess. ii. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 17.

¹¹ Heb. iv. 9.

¹² 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CONCLUSION.

WE have now reached the end of our enquiry, and it is possible to look back over the distance which we have travelled. Starting with the assumption that the Bible literature is a trustworthy record of historical events, we have found the beginning of a Divine revelation and promise at the very fount and origin of the human race. We have seen that the promise is early connected with rites of sacrificial worship, and that the fact of revelation is continued in the history of mankind, maintaining its connection with the past, while looking forward to the future. With the call of Abraham to be in himself and in his descendants the depository of the old and the recipient of further revelations, we find that the promise becomes more distinct, and at the same time the Divine providence creates situations in his family and amongst his descendants which constantly illustrate and enforce the truths with which we are familiar in the history and in the teaching of Jesus Christ. The intensity of this latter phenomenon is increased when we find the descendants of the Patriarchs, now grown into a nation, in bondage in Egypt. We have seen that the record of their deliverance from Egypt, linked as it is with the promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, presents at every stage a true likeness to the developed revelation of redemption and of salvation. This likeness culminates in the promise and fulfilment of God dwelling with men. We have seen how this was realized by the establishment of tabernacle, altar, priesthood, and the Law of Offerings. Our extended examination of these institutions has shown that they are indeed made in the likeness of Christ, and that in all their manifold detail they never fail to maintain this likeness. When we consider the familiarity of Moses with current Egyptian and Semitic rites, and the fact that an indiscriminating adoption of these would certainly have destroyed

the likeness in some respects, we are constrained to recognize that Divine Wisdom directed these regulations ; for in all the necessary complexity of detail, and in the adaptation in some cases of existing rites, and accommodation of the whole to actual circumstances, a particular and general fidelity to the Truth of Christ Jesus has ever been preserved. But this truth can have been known only to God ; so that in that portion of Scripture which we have been considering we have a notable advance in the course of the Divine revelation which is directed towards the coming of Christ.

The after-history of these remarkable institutions, like the history of the chosen people to whom they were given, is a chequered one. Much must have remained in abeyance through the years of wandering in the wilderness,¹ although it is clear that the tabernacle services were maintained. On the entry into Canaan the tabernacle was finally established at Shiloh,² but during the times of political confusion and national unfaithfulness it is easy to imagine, and the Book of Judges gives many intimations, that the law was very imperfectly observed. One of the innovations of this period was the occasional temporary separation of Ark and Tabernacle.³ A precedent had been afforded for this by the peculiar position assigned to the Ark by Divine command at the passage of the Jordan, and in the taking of Jericho. On such occasions of separation of Ark and Tabernacle it was customary to build a special altar and to offer sacrifices before the Ark,⁴ while, as we may suppose, the usual services of "the house of Jehovah" continued.⁵ The mention of the ephod of Gideon in Ophrah, and the statement that *all Israel played the harlot after it there*,⁶ implies the continuance of the high-priestly office in a central sanctuary ; and indeed the whole of an important section in the Book of Joshua⁷ is occupied with a story which shows how thoroughly this principle had been understood and accepted by the whole people when they finally entered on the possession of the promised land. However much the Israelites were affected by their contact with the remnant of the Canaanites in the direction of idolatrous practices,⁸ it is still a significant fact that in the Books of Joshua and Judges there is, we believe, no instance of sacrificial worship rendered to Jehovah apart from the Ark or the Tabernacle except where the angel of Jehovah mani-

¹ Amos v. 25, 26 ; Ezek. xx. 10-17 ; cf. Josh. v. 7. ² *Ib.* xviii. 1.

³ *Ib.* viii. 31-35 ; Judges xx. 27, 28 ; 1 Sam. iv. 3.

⁴ Josh. viii. 31 ; Judges xxi. 2-4.

⁵ *Ib.* xviii. 31 ; xix. 18.

⁶ *Ib.* viii. 27.

⁷ Josh. xxii.

⁸ Judges xvii. and xviii.

fested Himself;¹ and this exception we know to be in full accordance with the Mosaic Law.² Meanwhile it is clear that the worship of Baalim and Ashtaroth with sacrificial rites spread rapidly among the people.³ In the words of the Psalmist, *they tempted and rebelled against the Most High God, and kept not His testimonies; but turned back, and dealt treacherously like their fathers; they were turned aside like a deceitful bow. For they provoked Him to anger with their high places, and moved Him to jealousy with their graven images. When God heard this He was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel; so that He forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the Tent which He placed among men, and delivered His strength into captivity, and His glory into the adversary's hand.*⁴

But before the Lord forsook Shiloh He planted in Shiloh an institution which was destined to develop into yet another picture of the Christ. There had been prophets of Jehovah since Moses and before Samuel. Joshua himself received Divine communications, not only by an appearance of the Angel of Jehovah, but directly;⁵ and addressed the people in the well-known formula of the later prophets, *Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel.*⁶ And in the Book of Judges we read of a prophet who was sent to warn the people in the same formula of their rebellion.⁷ But the promise of God through Moses that Jehovah would raise up to the people a prophet like Moses⁸ still awaited fulfilment. This promise had been accompanied with an intimation that there would be prophets, both true and false, among the people.⁹ Although Joshua succeeded Moses, and experienced Divine communications, it was realized by his contemporaries that he was not like Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face.¹⁰ The theophanies granted to one and another during the times of the judges, and that solitary echo of Moses and Joshua in the voice of the unknown prophet of the Midianite oppression, were transient in character, and far from fulfilling the promise of Moses. That promise then awaited fulfilment; and the moment when the vision of the Christ which was given by tabernacle and priesthood and ordered offerings was about to be temporarily eclipsed is chosen by the Divine wisdom for the establishment of an order of prophets. These men are to

¹ Judges II. 5; VI. 25, 26; XIII. 15-23.

² Exod. XX. 24.

³ E.g. Josh. XXIV. 23; Judges VI. 25.

⁴ Ps. LXXVIII. 56-61.

⁵ E.g. Josh. III. 7; IV. 1, 15; V. 2; VII. 10; VIII. 1, 18; X. 8; XI. 6; XIII. 1;

XX. 1.

⁶ Josh. XXIV. 2.

⁷ Judges VI. 8.

⁸ Deut. XVIII. 15-19.

⁹ *Ib.* verses 20-22.

¹⁰ *Ib.* XXXIV. 10.

present a picture of the Christ, of equal importance and authority with the divinely appointed tabernacle service. The first of the long line of prophets is asked of God in the sanctuary at Shiloh, is brought there as soon as his mother had weaned him, is virtually adopted by the high priest and shares in priestly functions as a child ; there becomes the recipient of the word of Jehovah, and grows up to manhood with the general recognition of the people that he is *established to be a prophet of Jehovah*.¹ When at length after more than three hundred years of trial² Shiloh is rejected,³ and the Ark is carried off, never again to be reunited with the tabernacle, Samuel lives on ; and during the long period of depression when the central sanctuary is in abeyance he unites in his person the offices of priest and prophet. It cannot be without significance that the first of the line of prophets and the last were not only connected with the high-priestly office by their Nazirite consecration, as we have already remarked, but by the circumstances of their birth. If Samuel was asked and granted in the sanctuary, so also was John the Baptist ;⁴ and if Samuel exercised priestly functions, John was of the line of Aaron both on his father's and mother's side. These things did not happen by chance, but are determined by the constant necessity of a likeness to Christ, who is the end and goal of the whole revelation.

Here, then, with its roots firmly fixed in the older institution of tabernacle and priesthood, there arises the new institution of prophets. It was well perhaps that the order of prophets as a permanent institution amongst the chosen people should take its rise at a time when the tabernacle scheme was temporarily in abeyance, so that it might attain an equal position with it, and continue to hold this position when at length that system was restored. For indeed both were of Divine authority, and therefore truly co-ordinate. We cannot in this place do more than remind the reader how truly the prophetic order was made like Christ ; in its Divine origin in each particular case,⁵ in its message, in its authority, in its experiences, in its results, it continually foreshadowed the prophetic mission of the Christ. This likeness our Lord Jesus Himself emphasized in His parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, and in His lament over Jerusalem.⁶

¹ 1 Sam. i.-iii.

² Judges xi. 26.

³ Jer. vii. 12-15 ; xxvi. 6, 9.

⁴ Luke i. 13.

⁵ Amos ii. 11, 12. This passage connects prophets and Nazirites.

⁶ Luke xx. 9 ; xiii. 31-35.

But the period of eclipse of the tabernacle witness was not to be for ever. A further preparation for the Christ was near at hand, and when that had been completed, Prophet and Priest and King were to be united in one concurrent witness. An ancient oracle had foretold that the Peace-giver to Whom the obedience of the peoples should be rendered was to come from the tribe of Judah.¹ Moses had anticipated the time when there would be a king over Israel. Samuel, the first of the prophets, now anoints David, the chosen king, binding the kingly to the prophetic office, even as in his own person the prophetic office had been bound to the priestly order. There were only two kings who ruled over all Israel, David and Solomon, and the two in their combination are made like Christ.

Then, when at last David sits upon the throne of Jehovah, all necessary preparation is made, and when Solomon succeeds him the Divine plan is carried out, and in the place which Jehovah marked out, on that same spot or hill at least where God provided the lamb for sacrifice at the very beginning of all this wonderful development, there by the guidance of the Divine Spirit a noble fane was raised, the tent and tabernacle in stone, and the ark placed within it, the old tent and its furniture being reverently disposed of near by, and the glory of Jehovah filled it, as long since beneath Sinai it filled the tabernacle of Moses.

So the threefold witness was made permanent, if only the hearts of men were patient to receive it. But alas! those two elements of the witness whose permanence depended upon men were destined to eclipse. The Temple of Jehovah in Jerusalem was rejected like the House in Shiloh, and for the same reason.² The apostate seed of David was deposed from the throne of Jehovah until He should come Whose right it was, to Whom alone it would be given.³ But that element of the witness which was in the hands of God was never silenced or eclipsed. All through the long years of darkness and decline, the prophetic message rang clear, interpreting the history of Israel and the teaching of the law; declaring that offerings were not an end in themselves, and proclaiming the good things to come.

The Temple was restored, but not in its former glory. The throne remained empty, waiting. The last prophets gave their message, and then silence fell till Jesus came, as in the old days there fell a silence before the great redemption. Now

¹ Gen. XLIX. 10.² Jer. VII. 12-15.³ Ezek. XXI. 24-27.

He has come and gone and left His record behind Him. We have it in the books of the New Testament. And Israel? what of Israel? There is no temple, no altar, no priesthood, no offerings, no prophet, no king. We do not need them, though we read their history with reverent awe, for we have JESUS CHRIST.

APPENDIX.

- A. CHERUBIM.
- B. THE GLORY OF JEHOVAH.
- C. PSALM XXII. AND THE FEAST OF PEACE-OFFERINGS.
- D. SACRIFICIAL DEATH PROPERLY PENAL.
- E. THE SYNAGOGUE AND SACRIFICES.
- F. THE PROPHETS AND THE LAW OF OFFERINGS.
- G. THE CHINESE TRADITION OF SACRIFICE.

A. CHERUBIM.

A FEW words seem to be necessary in support of the view that the cherubim of Scripture are symbolic of created things, not of all creation indeed, but of that portion of God's creation of which man is the crown and the head.

We will briefly review the passages of Scripture where a cherub or cherubim are mentioned, and we believe that in every case it will be found that the explanation which is suggested will satisfy the context.

It may be premised that the derivation of the Hebrew word is a matter of great uncertainty, so that its meaning must be gathered from its use in the passages which we will consider.

The first occurrence of the word is in Gen. III. 24 where we read that *Jehovah God drove out the man, and He placed at the east of the garden of Eden the cherubim*. Nothing is said as to the nature of the cherubim, nor as to their form and appearance. The latter were probably known either by personal experience or by tradition to those persons who first committed this story to writing; this at least seems to be the natural explanation of the abrupt mention of "*the cherubim*". If they were human forms, symbolic of Man, their being placed at the east of the garden of Eden, when man was driven out, was symbolic of the restoration of man. We have seen that this interpretation fits the context of these words, and accounts for the facts which they narrate.

We next meet with cherubim in the history of the construction of the Tabernacle. We have seen that the narrative implies that they were human winged figures; and we have also observed that if they are taken as symbolic of Man they fit into the general scheme of symbolism of the Tabernacle and its furniture.

But when we say that the cherubim were symbolic of Human Nature, we do not mean of Human Nature to the exclusion of other forms of life, but rather of Human Nature as the top-stone of the building of God. The first chapter of Divine revelation shows that the creation of man is the crown of a long process of creative energy; and we do not think that in this symbol Man is regarded as separate from those forms of creation which preceded him, and over which he is placed as ruler, but is put for them as their true representative.

At the time of Samuel we first meet with the title *Jehovah of hosts* (1 Sam. i. 3, 11), a title which seems to be connected with the symbolism of the cherubim upon the ark, and the glory of Jehovah which was manifested between and over them. We read (1 Sam. iv. 4) of *the ark of the covenant of Jehovah of hosts, who inhabiteth the cherubim*. And in the account of the bringing up of the ark to Zion by David, the connection of the title Jehovah Sabaoth with His inhabitation of the cherubim is even more clearly marked. In 2 Sam. vi. 2 we read of *the ark of God, which is called by the Name, even the name of Jehovah of hosts that inhabiteth the cherubim*. If the cherubim were, as we have supposed, symbolic of mankind and of the creation over which he is given dominion, we can understand the appellation "Jehovah of hosts" as applied to the God Whose glory is manifested over the cherubim. It is, we think, an extension of this idea when David says of God in His employment of the powers of nature that *He rode upon a cherub and did fly* (2 Sam. xxii. 11), or when a later Psalmist declares, *Jehovah reigneth; let the peoples tremble; He inhabits cherubim; let the earth be moved* (Ps. xcix. 1).


We find that cherubim filled a large place in the Temple of Solomon. Two great winged cherubim of olive-wood overlaid with gold were made to stand in the Holiest Place, each ten medium cubits high, and with a wing expanse of ten cubits. A wing of each cherub touched the wall on either side, and their second wings met one another in the middle. The ark with its two smaller cherubim was placed between these. There is nothing to show that these cherubim were composite figures, and not simply, like the older cherubim, of human form. Such then we believe them to have been. It is noticeable, however, that on the walls of the sanctuary palm-trees and open flowers are combined with cherubim in the ornamentation (1 Kings vi. 29), answering to the cherubim embroidered upon the Tabernacle coverings; while outside we find oxen forming the base of the great Sea which answered to the laver of the Tabernacle; and lions, oxen, and cherubim as ornaments of the ten bases for the ten lavers of brass, the panels of these having also cherubim, lions, and palm-trees engraved upon them (1 Kings vii. 25, 29, 36). We find here, in association with cherubim, figures of vegetable life and two leading forms of animal life, the lion, as representative of wild beasts, and the ox, of cattle. All this seems to be in harmony with the assumed meaning of the symbol.

The next passage to be considered is the vision of Isaiah, where the "seraphim" or "flaming ones" can scarcely be different in symbolism from the cherubim. The prophet tells us that he *saw the Lord* (that is the Supreme Ruler) *sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and His train filled the temple. Above Him stood the seraphim, each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another and said, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory, or more literally, the fulness of the whole*

earth is His glory (Is. vi. 1-3). Here we have all the characteristic points of the cherubim. The position of the seraphim "above" the throne is like that of the cherubim above the mercy-seat, and evidently does not mark them as more exalted than the occupier of the throne, before Whom indeed they cover their faces. Their cry one to another confesses that Jehovah is Lord of hosts, and their declaration is that "the fulness of the whole earth is His glory". If, as we have supposed, these beings are themselves representative of the fulness of the whole earth, their confession and declaration are exactly in keeping. Isaiah does not tell us the number of the seraphim, nor does he describe their appearance otherwise than to say that each one had six wings; two of which covered his face, from which we conclude that each had one face only, like the cherubim upon the ark. This face must surely then have been human. The prophet also mentions their hands and their feet; the mention of hands being again in harmony with our supposition that their general aspect was human. From their being termed "seraphim," "flaming ones," we may gather that they had a fiery appearance.

We come now to the marvellous vision of Ezekiel, which must be briefly described. Four times over a vision of cherubim was granted to this prophet.

(1) Chs. I.-III. 15. This vision was seen by the prophet in his thirtieth year by the River Chebar. The description which he gives is not in all respects easy to understand, but we believe that what the prophet saw was in its general outline as follows. The glory of Jehovah appeared to him in the form of "a likeness as the appearance of a man," of fiery appearance, and with a rainbow over him. This Man appeared seated upon a throne of sapphire colour. The throne was placed upon "the likeness of a firmament," that is an expanse, probably also of azure colour, like the blue expanse of heaven (cf. Exod. XXIV. 10). This firmament, carrying the throne with its seated figure, was itself resting upon a wonderful "living creature". As we understand the prophet's description this living creature had the general appearance of a car or chariot, square in shape. At each corner stood a figure with four faces, and four wings, having the general "likeness of a man," and the hands of a man under its wings, the number of the hands not being stated. Connected with each of these figures, and by the side of it, there was a wheel probably as high as the figure itself. This was not a single wheel, but a wheel inside a wheel, that is perhaps two wheels at right angles to one another with a common diameter, one being slightly smaller than the other so as to be inside it. Both wheels and figures were full of eyes, and fiery bright in appearance. As to the arrangement of the faces and wings, we think that they might have been as in the diagram. In this diagram the dotted lines represent the position of



the four wings of each figure when expanded, two wings of each pair touching one another in the centre of each side of the square. The dark lines, bisecting the angles between the wings, represent the direction of the four faces of each figure. The wheels we think were in the planes of these faces (chapter i. 15). The arrangement of the faces was perhaps as indicated in the diagram. It is strange, however, that "the face of the cherub" in chapter x. 14 is evidently the face of an ox and not the face of a man; and with this must be compared the fact that the sole of their feet was like the sole of a calf's foot (ch. i. 7). It is possible, therefore, that the ox should take the prominent place which in the above diagram is given to the man, and that the other faces should be changed accordingly (ch. i. 10). The point does not seem to be of importance. When at rest the wings were let down, so that viewed from any quarter a pair of wings would be seen covering the body. The cherubim and the rims of the wheels were full of eyes on every side, so that the whole formed one complicated organism instinct with life, each cherub with its wheels maintaining its position with regard to all the others, and moving as they moved. The wheels are spoken of as whirling (ch. x. 13; cf. James III. 6?). Fire and lightnings filled the central space. It is very important to notice that the glory of Jehovah is quite distinct from this complex living creature, and is frequently separated from it (ch. ix. 3; x. 18). The colloquy in this first vision is between the Man upon the throne and the prophet. When the living creature speaks it is to say, "Blessed be the glory of Jehovah from His place" (ch. III. 12). Comparing this vision with the vision of Isaiah, there is the same fiery appearance, and the same adoration of Jehovah by the beings which the prophet saw. In Isaiah's vision the seraphim are ministrant to Jehovah; here, however, Jehovah appears as enthroned upon the cherubim, or as riding upon them, both which conceptions were already familiar to the mind of the Israelite. The number of wings in Ezekiel's vision is four instead of six in the vision of Isaiah, which shows conclusively that these are symbolic forms and not real entities. The number of cherubim, undefined by Isaiah, is here spoken of as four, which is the well-known number of creation. The bow which appeared over the head of the Divine Man throned upon this living creature is reminiscent of Jehovah's covenant with "every living creature of all flesh" (Gen. ix. 12-17); and the four faces of the cherubim are representative of "the birds, the cattle, and every beast of the earth" which are with man upon the earth (*ib.* ver. 10). On the whole, then, this vision seems to represent Jehovah as the covenant God and Lord of hosts, and confirms the interpretation which we have put upon the cherubim as representative of created things. Is it possible that the Chronicler was influenced by the vision of Ezekiel when he spoke of the great cherubim of Solomon's Temple as "the chariot" (1 Chron. xxviii. 18, 19)?

(2) Ch. III. 16, 23. Seven days after the last vision Ezekiel saw the same appearance.

(3) Chs. VIII.-XI. This remarkable vision was shown to Ezekiel about a year later at Jerusalem whither he was transported. "The glory of the God of Israel" appeared here in the same form as he had seen it in the two former visions (ch. VIII. 4). The appearance was seen first at the northern entrance of the Temple (VIII. 3), then inside the court (X. 3), and then at the eastern entrance (X. 19); and finally it removed to the mountain which is on the east side of the city, that is the Mount of Olives (XI. 23). The glory of Jehovah was sometimes over it and sometimes separated from it.

(4) Chs. XL.-XLVIII. This great vision was granted to Ezekiel nineteen years later. We cannot do more here than call attention to the reappearance in it of the cherubic chariot. The vision, which we do not attempt to explain, appears to refer to the time of the end, and of the restoration of all things; and it is of particular interest to notice that in this vision "the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east"—from that mountain to which it had retired in the former vision—"and His voice was like the sound of many waters, and the earth shined with His glory. And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw, even according to the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city; and the visions were like the vision that I saw by the River Chebar; and I fell upon my face" (ch. XLIII. 1-5). So the glory of Jehovah came into the house by the eastern gate, and filled the house; and the prophet heard One speaking to him out of the house; and a Man stood by him and said, "This is the place of My throne, and the place of the soles of My feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever". So that Jehovah had come to be Lord; it seems right that He should be seen riding upon cherubim when He comes to make His throne upon earth.

We pass now to the Apocalyptic vision. St. John is shown four living creatures in the midst of the throne and round about the throne. They have the faces respectively of a lion, a calf, a man, and an eagle. Their whole bodies are full of eyes. Each has six wings, and they cry continually, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God, the Almighty, Who was and Who is and Who is to come. We recognize the characteristic elements of the seraphim of Isaiah's and the living creatures of Ezekiel's vision. These living creatures give glory and honour and thanks to Him that sits on the throne; and the four and twenty elders, hearing it, worship the Eternal Everliving One with the words "Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power; for Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy will they were, and were created" (Rev. IV.). If then the twenty-four elders are symbolic of the chosen Church of Christ, which seems certain, the four living creatures seem to be symbolic of the whole creation, in accordance with their symbolism in the earlier visions of Scripture.

It may be significant that in the vision of a new heaven and a new earth, although there is a new Jerusalem which is the counter-

part of the twenty-four elders, there is nothing which corresponds to the four living creatures (Rev. xxi. 1-8). Is this not because the new heaven and new earth with all their varied life are themselves the fulfilment of the symbols of cherubim and seraphim and living creatures?

The description of Tyre as "the anointed cherub that covereth" in Ezek. xxviii. 14-16 may simply mean that Tyre was a specially favoured creation of God, "perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till unrighteousness was found in thee".

It may be noted that in the visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and St. John the cherubim occasionally share in the various actions which take place in the vision. It does not seem necessary to attach any special significance to their actions on these occasions; we regard them simply as the instruments of Jehovah in the pageantry of the vision.

On a review of the whole we are reminded that the cherubic forms are Divine representations, not human conceptions. God set them at the east of Eden; God shows the pattern of them to Moses and to David; God revealed them in vision to Isaiah, Ezekiel, and St. John.

At the same time it is not without value to observe that men have figured similar conceptions in a similar manner. It is reasonable to suppose that as the symbols were presented for men to see they would be presented in a form which men might readily understand; so that while they are all of Divine origin, they are yet in a true sense natural.

B. THE GLORY OF JEHOVAH.

THE first occurrence of this phrase is in Exod. xvi. 6, 7, where we read that *Moses and Aaron said unto all the children of Israel, At even, then ye shall know that Jehovah hath brought you out from the land of Egypt: and in the morning, then ye shall see the glory of Jehovah.* The occasion was the murmuring of the people in the wilderness of Sin, and the promise refers to the quails which appeared on the evening of that day, and to the manna which was first found on the following morning. These miracles were indeed, the first, a proof that Jehovah and not Moses had brought Israel out of Egypt, the second, a signal manifestation of the glory of Jehovah. But it is clear that the phrase in this passage is to be taken in a figurative sense of the majesty and power of Jehovah, as elsewhere also it is joined with greatness (Deut. v. 24), power (Ps. lxiii. 2), excellency (Is. xxxv. 2), or fame (Is. lxvi. 19). In its special reference, as denoting a physical manifestation, it occurs first in Exod. xvi. 10 and xxiv. 16, 17. In the first passage we are told that as Israel looked toward the wilderness *the glory of Jehovah appeared in the cloud.* This must have been a brightness different from the usual fiery appearance of the cloud at night. In the second passage we read that after Moses had been summoned to ascend Mount Sinai, *the glory of*

Jehovah abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it (i.e. either the glory or the mount) *six days, and the seventh day He called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud. And the appearance of the glory of Jehovah was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel.* This glory then was as it were resident in the cloud and at times shone forth. Again when God directed the making of a sanctuary He promised that the tent would be sanctified by His glory (Exod. xxix. 43). In literal fulfilment of this promise we find that when the tabernacle was completed the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and *the glory of Jehovah filled the tabernacle* (Exod. xl. 34, 35). We are expressly told that while this brightness filled the tabernacle Moses was not able to enter the tent, which is a clear indication that ordinarily it was not so manifested in the holy place. In Lev. xvi. 2, however, Aaron is forbidden to enter the holiest place except once a year, *for I will appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat.* Our first impression on reading these words may be that there was always an appearance of brightness above the mercy-seat, but closer consideration will show that this is not stated. At any rate the appearance is connected with the presence of the cloud, which continued during the wanderings of Israel, but not afterwards. When Aaron's ministry was inaugurated an appearance of this glory was promised to all the people and was actually witnessed by them (Lev. ix. 6, 23). On this occasion fire came out from before Jehovah and consumed the offerings upon the altar, which moved the people to a great shout and to fall on their faces in worship. In a similar manner when the ark was carried into Solomon's Temple and the priests had come out from performing the service *the cloud filled the house of Jehovah, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud; for the glory of Jehovah filled the house of Jehovah* (1 Kings viii. 10, 11, and 2 Chron. v. 11-14). The Chronicler adds the additional circumstance that after Solomon's prayer of dedication *fire came down from heaven* and consumed the sacrifices, while *the glory of Jehovah still filled the house* (2 Chron. vii. 1). All the people saw the fire fall, and the glory resting upon the house, and they like their fathers of old bowed their faces to the ground in worship.

After the departure from Sinai and during their wanderings in the wilderness this glory was shown to all the people on two occasions only. The first was when the people rebelled on receiving the discouraging report of the spies (Num. xiv. 10); the second was at the great rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, when on two successive days the glory appeared (Num. xvi. 19, 42). On one other occasion of the people's rebellion the glory of Jehovah appeared to Moses and Aaron at the door of the tent of meeting, but it is not stated whether it was seen by the assembly whom they had just left (Num. xx. 6).

It is interesting to enquire into the relation of this glory to the cherubim upon the mercy-seat. The Voice of God which addressed Moses came *from above the mercy-seat* and *from between the cherubim*

(Num. vii. 89). In Lev. xvi. 2 God says that He will appear *in the cloud upon the mercy-seat*. The Israelites seeing the cloud resting upon the tent (Exod. xl. 38; Num. ix. 15-23), must have known that it penetrated the tent and tabernacle and rested upon the mercy-seat; and that just there between the cherubim was the place where the Glory appeared and from which the Voice was heard. When the cloud was lifted up from the tabernacle it was removed also from the ark, and the priests on entering would see neither cloud nor glory; but where the cloud next rested, there the priests would prepare its dwelling-place, when as we may suppose the cloud again covered the tent. In this way the mercy-seat and cherubim would be conceived of as the throne of God; and the cherubim, though standing above the glory, yet from another point of view were underneath the cloud, which was seated as it were above them, as well as present between them. This may have suggested the title of Jehovah, which first occurs in 1 Sam. iv. 4, as He Who *sits upon*, or is *enthroned above*, He Who inhabits or rides the cherubim. It is very noticeable that in this place occurs also for the first time that other title of Jehovah, *Jehovah of hosts*, which is afterwards so frequent in Scripture. If the cherubim in human form were indeed, as we have supposed, symbolic of humanity as the head of God's creation, an idea which is still further expressed in the more composite forms which they take in later visions, then the collocation of the two titles, Jehovah of hosts and He Who sits the cherubim is peculiarly appropriate, and indeed the one may be derived from the other.

In the great vision of Isaiah we see the *seraphim*, the flaming ones, standing above the throne of the Lord (Is. vi. 1). We can scarcely be wrong in identifying these with the *cherubim* and *living creatures* of other visions, and if so their position may be illustrated by the position of the cherubim in the tabernacle, and the still larger overshadowing cherubim of the Temple. Their cry, as Isaiah heard it, interprets to us the significance of the vision. *One cried unto another and said, Holy, holy, holy is Jehovah of hosts; the fulness of the whole earth is His glory.* The fulness of the whole earth, of which Man is the appointed head, is the conception symbolized by the cherubim. In the midst of this, immanent in His own creation, the glory of Jehovah is manifested. But while immanent in His works, He also transcends them, and in glorious majesty rides the cherubim. The title occurs again in 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 1 Chron. xiii. 6; 2 Kings xix. 15, and in two Psalms of the time of David or later, Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1. In strict accordance with this is the manner in which the glory of Jehovah was shown to Ezekiel in each of his four visions (see (1) Ezek. i. 28; iii. 12. (2) iii. 23. (3) viii. 4; ix. 3; x. 4, 18, 19; xi. 23. (4) xliii. 2, 4, 5; xliiv. 4). In these visions the glory of Jehovah rides upon the cherubic forms, but is clearly independent of them. With the cherubim now appear wheels, giving to the whole complex living creature still more the appearance of a movable throne or chariot. The visions indeed re-

call an earlier word of David, *He rode upon a cherub and did fly* (Ps. xviii. 10; 2 Sam. xxii. 11). Is it possible that the visions of Ezekiel were in the mind of the Chronicler when he called the great pair of cherubim which Solomon made to spread out their wings and cover the ark in his Temple, *the chariot* (1 Chron. xxviii. 18)?

Passing now to the New Testament we are taught there to find the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. God dwells with men no longer now in a movable tent, but by having become incarnate. This incarnation of the Godhead chiefly hides, though it also at times reveals the resident glory (John i. 14; ii. 11). On one supreme occasion, upon the mount of transfiguration, the whole house was filled with glory, but it soon retreated again to the inner sanctuary. The veil of His flesh screened that brightness during the days of His earthly life, and it was not until the Son of Man had been lifted up, first upon the cross, and then from His grave, that He was declared to be the Son of God with power, and there was given the open revelation of His Deity. Now for those who come to God through the way which He has opened, there is a daily vision of His glory, in the face of Jesus Christ, which has for them a transforming power into the same image from glory to glory, even as the face of Moses caught the Divine effulgence when He went in to speak with God. And for the happy souls whose spiritual eye sees this vision, there remains a further sight of the glory of God, it may be like Stephen at the moment of their departure (Acts vii. 55), it certainly will be like Moses and Elijah in the glory "over there" (Luke ix. 31). For their home is to be with the angels who live and move in the glory of the Lord (Luke ii. 9), and in the new Jerusalem which the glory of God lightens (Rev. xxi. 23).

And beyond this is a day when our Lord Jesus shall come in the glory of His Father with all the holy angels, which will be to the world the revelation of His glory (1 Peter iv. 13). That glory which was for a time concealed in the recesses of an earthly sanctuary, and then in the Person of the incarnate Saviour, and which is now hidden in the heavenly places and inmost sanctuary above, shall in its day return and fill the whole earth with its glory (Num. xiv. 21; Ps. lxxii. 19; Is. xl. 5; Is. xl. 9, and Hab. ii. 14). It may be indeed that during the millennial reign there will be some localized manifestation of the glory of Jehovah (Is. xl. 10); but it is certain that there will be open demonstration and world-wide recognition that Christ is both Lord and God, to the confounding of the rebellious, and the restoration of peace and righteousness in every land. And these things are but the vestibule to new heavens and a new earth where God is all in all.

Well may we close with the doxology of St. Jude. "Now unto Him that is able to guard you from stumbling, and to set you before the presence of His glory without blemish in exceeding joy, to the only God our Saviour, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory,

majesty, dominion and power, before all time, and now, and for evermore. Amen."

C. PSALM XXII. AND THE FEAST OF PEACE-OFFERINGS.

THERE are three Psalms, all ascribed to David, which bear a certain general resemblance to one another, the 109th, the 69th, and the 22nd. Each one of these Psalms might be entitled *A Cry of Anguish and a Song of Praise*. Ps. cix. through twenty-nine sorrowful verses is a cry of anguish, its song of praise consisting of the last two verses only. In Ps. lxix. the cries of distress also fill twenty-nine verses, but the song of praise has swelled to seven. In Ps. xxii. twenty-one verses only are a cry, and ten verses are a song. In the first two Psalms also we find something which is totally absent from the last. In Psalm cix. David quotes at length the bitter curses of adversaries who rewarded hatred for his love. Verses 6 to 19 are occupied with the recital of this poignant grief, but in verse 20 he assures himself that these curses cannot bring him harm, but will recoil on the head of his persecutors. "This is the reward of mine adversaries from Jehovah, and of them that speak evil against my soul." With this assurance he falls to prayer. "Let them curse, but bless Thou; when they arise they shall be put to shame, but Thy servant shall rejoice. Let mine adversaries be clothed with dishonour, and let them cover themselves with their own shame as with a robe." The same element of imprecation appears in Ps. lxix., and bursts from the sore heart of the Psalmist through seven verses of his distressful cry, "Let their table before them become a snare . . . let their eyes be darkened . . . let their habitation be desolate . . . add iniquity unto their iniquity . . . let them be blotted out of the book of the living." Now such language as this is conspicuously absent from Ps. xxii., though the anguish is, if possible, deeper than in those other Psalms. In Ps. cix. indeed the distress is entirely on account of the attacks of wicked, deceitful, and ungrateful men. In Ps. lxix. there is an added element of God-forsakenness, though the word is not spoken out. "Mine eyes fail while I wait for God . . . answer me, O Jehovah . . . turn Thou unto me . . . hide not Thy face from Thy servant . . . draw nigh unto my soul." Still this does not amount to a sense that God had actually forsaken the Psalmist. At most it is a delay, a temporary silence, a turning aside, a hiding of His Face, a certain distance in his God. But in Ps. xxii. God-forsakenness is the very soul of the grief. "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me . . . so far from helping me . . . thou answerest not . . . be not far from me . . . be not Thou far off, O Jehovah . . . haste Thee to help me." The reproach and contumely of men are there too, and are felt in fullest measure, but no syllable of imprecation on men passes the sufferer's lips. He prays only to be delivered from them, he asks for nothing to be directed against them.

This is one of the great contrasts which distinguish these otherwise similar Psalms. The 69th and 109th differ only in degree, the 22nd differs from them both in kind. The first two record the experiences of David, the last is a prophecy of David's Son. We may find points of contact between the experiences of David and those of the Son of David, but we find still more a contrast. In Ps. LXIX. as compared with CIX. there is simply a more poignant grief leading to a more anguished cry; and, when deliverance is granted, prompting a more fervent thanksgiving. But traces of human weakness and imperfection abound. In Ps. CIX. it is not merely the ingratitude of foes, but the fact that they assailed the Psalmist when he was poor and needy and broken-hearted, weak through fasting and physically in a low condition, by the hand of the Lord upon him. In Ps. LXIX., though he is innocent of the charges brought against him, he is fully conscious of his acts of folly, and that these and his sins were not hid from Jehovah. If a true servant he is still a sinful servant, and in greatest need of the loving-kindness and tender mercies of God. In Ps. CIX. again the imprecations uttered against himself, which he knew would recoil upon his adversaries, he also takes upon his own lips, just as in Ps. LXIX. the deeper grief finds vent in more passionate imprecation. But the Sufferer in Ps. XXII. is a different Man, like but still more unlike David. He is not broken down, much less a sinful man. His whole indignity is that which is heaped upon him; he has no foolishness or sins to mourn. From his lips no imprecations are forced. We feel that this is not David, it is the Christ; with the Gospel records before us it is JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.

We think that it is quite possible, in the face of these contrasts, to admit that the imprecations which form so large a part of the cry of distress in David are really a part of his human weakness. But it would not be true to the teaching of Scripture to allow that this is the whole account of the matter. We feel when we read of Job or of Jeremiah cursing his day (Job III.; Jer. xx. 14), that these things are written for our learning as a picture of the inherent weakness of even the best of God's servants. And we are sure that these words of the prophet Jeremiah were not spoken under the influence of the Holy Spirit of God, but by his own querulous spirit. In the case of the Psalms of David, however, there is more than the mere record of a good man's sorrows and weaknesses. In David's case the judgment of Jehovah coincided with his own. Though the spirit which gave rise to the words may have been largely influenced by human infirmity, yet the occasion was ordered by the providence of God, and the language remained under the control of the Holy Spirit. In other words we know that the course of David's life, and the current of his experiences (certainly up to the time of his great fall), were shaped so as to be a likeness of his greater Son. And we know also that the Spirit of Jehovah spoke by him, and that His word was on his tongue (2 Sam. XXIII. 2). So we believe that even in his words against his

enemies the words of David were not allowed to stray beyond the truth, but were made to declare what was the judgment of Jehovah upon the enemies of His Christ. If the words of a Caiaphas, moved by purest hate and envy, might be made to convey the truth of God, and preach the Gospel in the Jewish Sanhedrin, how much more might the man after God's own heart, and the Ancestor and signal Type of Jesus Christ, even in his natural feelings of antagonism towards the authors of undeserved injuries to himself, be so guided as to speak the judgment of God towards the enemies of Christ. That he was so guided both St. Peter and St. Paul and our Lord Jesus Christ Himself have assured us. The undeserved enmity shown towards David was part of the plan which made David like Christ. The confidence of David that the curses of his enemies would recoil upon themselves, expressed in a writing which has been included in Holy Scripture, was also a part of the plan. The prayer against his enemies recorded in Scripture was a first warning to the enemies of the true Anointed of Jehovah. As such it was held up to the view of those Jews who rejected Him by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiii. 38), and also by St. Paul (Rom. xi. 9, 10). It applies not only to them and to Judas (Acts i. 16, 20), but to all who wilfully oppose the Christ of God. But it is right that the revelation of the righteous judgment of God should be revealed in connection with the typical experiences of David rather than with the prophetic picture of the rejected and crucified One. Ps. LXIX. and CIX. concern David in his typical experiences, Ps. XXII. describes the Crucifixion and the grace that should follow. The Lord the Spirit, whose Hand was guiding all, knew that the prayer, Father forgive them, would form part of that Scene. Can we doubt that for this reason, not in contradiction to the truth of the type or the record of that truth, but so as to harmonize exactly with the Scene foretold, no single word of judgment is pronounced here upon the persecutors and murderers? Although the Sufferer was the reproach of mankind and despised by the chosen people, an invitation is extended by Him to all the seed of Israel, and all the ends of the earth, and all the kindreds of the nations, to share with Him in the fruit of His sufferings. None are excluded who will remember and turn to Jehovah. But this does not annul what is said elsewhere against the impenitent and unbelieving. Their doom is already recorded. In this Psalm there stands only the picture of a Cross with arms outstretched to save, true likeness of the Lord and of His Gospel of grace.

It would be a study of deep interest and profit to compare clause by clause the sufferings of David as described in Ps. LXIX. and CIX. with the sufferings of Christ depicted in Ps. XXII. Such a study would bring out still more clearly the contrast between the two. But here, for our special purpose, we will compare only the songs of praise. These will show as before a general likeness with a still stronger contrast. And in this contrast we shall learn that the Holy Spirit bids us see in the sacrificial feast of the Mosaic Law a picture of the Gospel Feast, and of its spiritual blessings.

In Ps. cix. David looks for deliverance, and declares that it shall be made known by psalm and praise among the multitude, for his own case is intended to be an example to the needy. "I will give great thanks unto Jehovah with my mouth: yea, I will praise Him among the multitude. For He will stand at the right hand of the needy, to save him from them that judge his soul." David was set on an eminence, and he knew that his experiences were intended to be an example to the needy. He was a true prophet, not only becoming a sign in his own person, but with the obligation to interpret it in the name of the Lord.

In Ps. lxix. David is sure that God's salvation will set him up on high. He determines when this takes place to praise the name of God with a song and magnify Him with thanksgiving. This, he considers, will please the Lord better than a sacrifice of thanksgiving, an ox offered in the Temple. The written record is more lasting than the ceremonial observance. No mere sacrifice then (though this may have been offered too for the meek to *see* and be glad) but a Song of Praise is what David determines to render. And that Song of Praise is before us to-day, its effects having been felt throughout the ages. The meek have seen it and read it all the world over, from generation to generation, and have been glad. "Ye that seek after God," is its call for ever, "let your heart live; for Jehovah heareth the needy, and despiseth not His prisoners. Let heaven and earth praise Him, the seas and everything that moveth therein; for God will save Zion and build the cities of Judah, and they shall abide there and have it in possession. The seed also of His servants shall inherit it, and they that love His name shall dwell therein." Of all this the deliverance of David is seal and pledge. The revelation brightens, but it is not yet high day.

Now let us turn to Ps. xxii. where it is no longer David, but the Spirit of Christ speaking through David; prepared indeed by his own experiences to be the vehicle of this revelation, but speaking here not his own experiences but those of Another (1 Pet. i. 10, 11). Let us read now this Song of Praise. Here we find the same expression of a knowledge that the suffering and deliverance are intended for the encouragement of others, which we have noticed in the other Psalms. Here is also the same resolve to make known the deliverance for their encouragement; and the same consciousness that the message is for all lands and for all time. But in Ps. xxii. this is not all. We have seen that David would celebrate the deliverance by a Psalm rather than by a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Any feast that he could prepare would be limited in scope, transient in character, upon a bullock that hath horns and hoofs. But his Song would sound through the ages, when he himself and his music and his ceremonial had "seen corruption," or had passed away. But the Sufferer of this Psalm, undaunted by decay, pays His vows and spreads His Feast. He is indeed like David a great Exemplar of the truth that Jehovah despises not the affliction of the afflicted;

but He is more than this. His vows are paid not with a bullock that hath horns and hoofs, nor by an assembly in a local temple. The scene expands into a world-wide observance, and an assembly so great as to know no bounds. "Ye that fear Jehovah. . . all ye the seed of Jacob. . . all ye the seed of Israel," attend and hear; and further still, for the sound of the deliverance shall go out into all lands, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn unto Jehovah, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee." Not only "the meek" among the chosen people "shall eat and be satisfied," but "all the fat ones of the earth shall eat and worship". "All they that go down to the dust," every one "that cannot keep his soul alive," the countless myriads of mortal men, shall bow before Jehovah in this great feast of thanksgiving; for the great cause of congratulation is not "Let your heart live," but "let it live *for ever*". This Sufferer then was "brought into the dust of death" that all those who go down to the dust turning to God through Him should live for ever. The Feast which He spreads is everywhere present and it brings life for evermore. It is the good tidings of "His righteousness" and that "He hath done it"; the proclamation of a completed work, and the invitation to the true feast of peace-offerings.

D. SACRIFICIAL DEATH PROPERLY PENAL.

WE have seen that the death of the victim in sacrificial worship is in the strictest sense a penal death, and represents the punishment due to sin. There are some passages in the prophets in which predicted judgment upon sin is compared to the slaughter of sacrificial victims.

The first to which we shall draw attention is in Deut. xxxii. 40-43, which is a prediction of judgment yet to fall upon the enemies of the Israelite people. Here the arrows of God's judgment are said to drink the blood of those slain by them, and the sword of His judgment to devour their flesh. This is a common and natural simile which often occurs in Scripture (2 Sam. i. 22). But this vengeance upon His adversaries is also said to make expiation and atonement for God's land and for His people. This is evidently with reference to the constant language of the Law that atonement is made by blood-shedding.

The 34th chapter of Isaiah and the 39th chapter of Ezekiel we believe to refer to the same event as the prophecy of Moses in the Book of Deuteronomy. The subject of Isaiah's words is a future day of vengeance and year of recompense for the cause of Zion. He, like Moses, speaks of the sword of Jehovah being filled with the blood and with the fat of the nations. But he compares those nations to rams and to goats, and their slaughter to a sacrifice. In the prophecy of Ezekiel the figure is enlarged. Not only is there a great sacrifice, but there are invited guests. The beasts and the birds are summoned to the sacrifice that Jehovah has sacrificed for them. They are called to eat the flesh of the mighty, and drink the blood of princes. These

are compared to sacrificial victims, and the beasts and birds are to be filled with them at the table of Jehovah. This language is borrowed from the sacrificial feasts of the Law. But it is important to notice that it is only an adaptation of the sacrificial rite, and that no real parallel is drawn between that scene of awful judgment and the feast on a sacrifice of peace-offerings. The sole point of contact seems to be that both in the predicted judgment and in the sacrifice of peace-offerings there was penal death followed by a feast. The penal death which overtook the enemies of Israel satisfied the Sword of Jehovah, even as the sacrificial victim was slain before Jehovah and in vindication of His just claims. But there is not the remotest reference in Isaiah or in Ezekiel to the sweet savour of the fat of the sacrifices. The fat of the slain in both these prophets is the food not of Jehovah Himself but of His Sword, and of the invited guests. These are summoned to eat the fat and drink the blood along with the Sword of Jehovah, a phraseology which shows that this sacrifice is no sacrifice of peace-offerings, where both fat and blood were prohibited to the guests. In the 19th chapter of the Revelation we read of the birds being summoned to a great supper of God in language somewhat similar to that of Ezekiel; but there the sacrificial imagery is dropped, probably because the judgment referred to had just been described as treading the peoples in a winepress, and not as slaying them in sacrifice.

In Zephaniah i. impending judgment upon Judah is compared to a sacrifice with invited guests; and in Jeremiah XLVI. 10, the overthrow of the Egyptian army by the Babylonians at Carchemish is described by the prophet thus: "that day is a day of the Lord, Jehovah of hosts, a day of vengeance, that He may avenge Him of His adversaries, and the sword shall devour and be satiate, and shall drink its fill of their blood. For the Lord, Jehovah of hosts, hath a sacrifice in the north country by the River Euphrates."

The implied testimony of these passages to the penal character of sacrificial death is worthy of notice.

E. THE SYNAGOGUE AND SACRIFICES.

THE following extract from Dr. Edersheim's book on the Temple (pp. 118-22) contains much of interest:—

"It is deeply interesting to know that the New Testament view of sacrifices is entirely in accordance with that of the ancient Synagogue. At the threshold we here meet the principle: 'There is no atonement except by blood'. In accordance with this we quote the following from Jewish interpreters. Rashi says: 'The soul of every creature is bound up in its blood; therefore I gave it to atone for the soul of man—that one soul should come and atone for the other'. Similarly Aben Ezra writes: 'One soul is a substitute for the other'. And Moses ben Nachmann: 'I gave the soul for you on the altar, that the soul of the animal should be an atonement for the soul of the man'. These quotations might be almost indefinitely multiplied.

Another phase of Scriptural truth appears in such Rabbinical statements as that by the imposition of hands 'the offerer, as it were, puts away his sins from himself, and transfers them upon the living animal'; and that 'as often as any one sins with his soul, whether from haste or malice, he puts away his sin from himself, and places it upon the head of his sacrifice, and it is an atonement for him'. Hence also the principle laid down by Abarbanel, that 'after the prayer of confession (connected with the imposition of hands) the sins of the children lay on the sacrifice (of the Day of Atonement)'. This, according to Maimonides, explains why every one who had anything to do with the sacrifice of the red heifer, or the goat on the Day of Atonement, or similar offerings¹ was rendered unclean; since these animals were regarded as actually sin-bearing. In fact, according to Rabbinical expression, the sin-bearing animal is on that ground expressly designated as something to be rejected and abominable.² . . .

"There is yet one other phase on which the Synagogue lays stress. It is best expressed in the following quotation, to which many similar might be added: 'Properly speaking, the blood of the sinner should have been shed, and his body burned, as those of the sacrifices. But the Holy One—blessed be He!—accepted our sacrifice from us as redemption and atonement. Behold the full grace which Jehovah—blessed be He!—has shown to man! In His compassion and in the fulness of His grace He accepted the soul of the animal instead of his soul, that through it there might be an atonement.' Hence also the principle, so important as an answer to the question, Whether the Israelites of old had understood the meaning of sacrifices? 'He that brought a sacrifice required to come to the knowledge that that sacrifice was his redemption.'

"In view of all this, the deep-felt want so often expressed by the Synagogue is most touching. In the liturgy for the Day of Atonement we read: 'While the altar and the sanctuary were still in their places, we were atoned for by the goats, designated by lot. But now for our guilt, if Jehovah be pleased to destroy us, he takes from our hand neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice.' We add only one more out of many similar passages in the Jewish Prayer Book. 'We have spoken violence and rebellion; we have walked in a way that is not right. Behold, our transgressions have increased upon us; they press upon us like a burden; they have gone over our heads; we have forsaken Thy commandments, which are excellent. And wherewith shall we appear before Thee, the mighty God, to atone for our transgressions, and to put away our trespasses, and to remove sin, and to magnify Thy grace? Sacrifices and offerings are no more; sin and trespass-offerings have ceased; the blood of sacrifices is no longer sprinkled; destroyed is Thy holy house, and fallen the gates of Thy sanctuary; Thy holy city lies desolate; Thou hast slain, sent from

¹ This statement appears to be inaccurate, except as regards the red heifer.

² This seems to be directly contrary to the Mosaic rule.

Thy presence; they have gone, driven forth from Thy face, the priests who brought Thy sacrifices!’ Accordingly, also, the petition frequently recurs: ‘Raise up for us a right Intercessor (that it may be true), I have found a ransom (an atonement, or covering)’. And on the Day of Atonement, as in substance frequently on other occasions, they pray: ‘Bring us back in jubilee to Zion, Thy city, and in joy as of old to Jerusalem, the house of Thy holiness! Then shall we bring before Thy face the sacrifices that are due.’

“Who shall make answer to this deep lament of exiled Judah? Where shall a ransom be found to take the place of their sacrifices? In their despair some appeal to the merits of the fathers or of the pious; others to their own or to Israel’s sufferings, or to death, which is regarded as the last expiation. But the most melancholy exhibition, perhaps, is that of an attempted sacrifice by each pious Israelite on the eve of the Day of Atonement. Taking for males a white cock, and for females a hen, the head of the house prays: ‘The children of men who dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death, bound in misery and iron—they will He bring forth from darkness and the shadow of death, and break their bonds asunder. Fools, because of their transgressions and because of their iniquities, are afflicted; their soul abhorreth all manner of meat, and they draw near unto the gates of death. Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble, that He save them out of their distresses. He sends His word and heals them, and delivers them from their destruction. Then they praise the Lord for His goodness, and for His marvellous works to the children of men. If there be an angel with Him, an intercessor, one among a thousand, to show unto men His righteousness, then He is gracious unto him and saith, Let him go, that he may not go down into the pit; I have found an atonement (a covering).’ Next, the head of the house swings the sacrifice round his head saying, ‘This is my substitute; this is in exchange for me; this is my atonement. This cock goes into death, but may I enter into a long and happy life, and into peace.’ Then he repeats this prayer three times, and lays his hands on the sacrifice which is now slain.

“This offering up of an animal not sanctioned by the law, in a place, in a manner, and by hands not authorized by God, is it not a terrible phantom of Israel’s dark and dreary night?”

As we read this passage do we not feel that the Synagogue has failed to see what was so clearly intimated in the law, and what is so fully argued in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that “it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins,” and that these are “only cardinal ordinances imposed until a time of reformation” (Heb. x. 4 and ix. 10)? When that Epistle was written these things were “nigh to vanishing away,” and now they have vanished. Oh! that the veil were removed from the eyes of Israel, so that they might see that work of which these things were the true copy and shadow, indeed, but not its very substance.

F. THE PROPHETS AND THE LAW OF OFFERINGS.

THE teaching of the Prophets with regard to the Law of Offerings is a subject of great interest and importance; but an examination of all their references to it, direct or implied, or of all the passages where they insist on the paramount duty of obedience to the Moral Law contained in the Mosaic Books, would occupy a large space, and it is not possible to enter upon it here. We have frequently drawn attention in the chapters of this book to passages in the later Scriptures which presuppose the Mosaic Law of Offerings, and we believe that all that is written in the later prophets will be found to be in complete agreement with the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xx. 22-xxiii.), the exhortations in Deuteronomy, and the teachings of Joshua and of Samuel. It is particularly interesting to note in the history of Samuel that he rebukes Saul for acting against his conscience and himself offering a burnt-offering, declaring that by so doing Saul had not kept the commandment of Jehovah (1 Sam. xiii. 12, 13). This evidently presupposes and enforces the ordinance of a priestly prerogative of offering sacrifices. On the other hand Samuel insists as strongly as any of the later prophets that sacrifices offered according to the prescribed ritual are not pleasing to God, if they are offered by the backsliding and disobedient. *Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as idolatry and teraphim* (1 Sam. xv. 22, 23). And in these words Samuel accurately reproduces the spirit and letter of the Law given through Moses. The position which the promulgation of the Decalogue holds in the history of the Exodus, and the place which its tablets occupied in the Sanctuary, are typical of its paramount claims upon the people. These claims it was the duty of every prophet from Moses to John the Baptist to emphasize and to enforce; and we find that, with a constant regard to the institutions of the Sanctuary as of Divine origin and binding authority, they are insistent that neither Holy Place nor Holy Land (Exod. xv. 17; Zech. ii. 12) can be pleasing without a Holy People (Exod. xix. 3-6). We append a selection of passages which illustrate the teaching of the prophets on this subject, but only as specimens of a class:—

Ps. l. 5-15; Prov. xv. 8; xxi. 3, 27; Eccles. v. 1.

Is. i. 10-20; lxvi. 1-4.

Jer. vi. 16-21; vii. 1-26; xiv. 10-12.

Ezek. xx., xxii. 23-31.

Hos. iv. 6-8; vi. 4-7; viii. 11-13.

Joel ii. 12-14.

Amos v. 21-24.

Mic. vi. 6-8.

Zeph. iii. 4-7.

Hag. ii. 10-14.

Zech. vii. 1-14.

Mal. i. 6-14.

G. THE CHINESE TRADITION OF SACRIFICE.

IF it be indeed a truth that the sacrificial worship of God owes its origin to a primitive revelation, in the infancy of the human race, we may reasonably expect to find sacrificial observances co-extensive with the race. We may also expect to find that this form of worship has been transferred to all those other Powers to whom men have turned aside in their departure from the Creator. This is exactly what we do find in the world to-day. The beliefs and practices of every nation in this respect must then be to us not a matter of human interest alone, but a subject of deeper and more sacred importance. We may hope to discover in them some remnants of that primitive revelation, which as developed under Divine authority is the subject of this book; and which as handed down in the Mosaic Law was at once fulfilled and explained by the coming of Jesus Christ. The discovery of such elements of primitive truth has a strange power to move the soul. It seems to make the whole world kin. It reminds us that the Promise of the Gospel is to all mankind; and that every one of these nations has so far retained its title-deeds to the inheritance of Christ in the Gospel.

In this short essay the enquiry is limited in scope. I propose to enquire how far we may trace in the records of a single nation, but that a great and populous and ancient nation, such vestiges of a primitive revelation of sacrificial worship. The Chinese nation offers in its ancient literature special facilities for such an enquiry, and indeed it is not my purpose to describe Chinese sacrificial observances of the present day, but to go back to the earliest records which are available. At the same time it is not to be forgotten that the sayings which I shall quote, and the thoughts which they embody, have up till very recent times formed part of the common knowledge of every scholar in China, and are the basis of all current ceremonial observances. What truths may be found in them, though already covered over at the time when they were written by many philosophic errors and trivial banalities, and since then more thoroughly obscured by the forms and superstitions of Buddhism, still remain at the present day, to be rescued, if it may be, and made to bear witness to the Truth.

The book upon which I rely chiefly in this enquiry is the "Lî Kî," or "Collection of Treatises on the Rules of Propriety or Ceremonial Usages". The book is available for English readers in a translation by Dr. Legge in the series of "Sacred Books of the East" published by the Oxford Clarendon Press. As regards the date to which we are carried back by the "Lî Kî," Dr. Legge writes in his Introduction as follows: "More may be learned about the religion of the ancient Chinese from this classic than from all the others together. Where the writers got their information about the highest worship and sacrifices of the most ancient times . . . we do not know. They expressed the views, doubtless, that were current during the Han dynasty (*circ.* 200 B.C.), derived partly from tradi-

tion, and partly from old books which were not gathered up." In this 2000 years' old classic there are several books which are of special value for our present purpose, chiefly Book VII on Ceremonial Usages, their Origin, Development, and Intention; Book VIII on Rites in the Formation of Character; Book IX on the Single Victim at the Border Sacrifices; Books XX to XXII on the Law of Sacrifices, the Meaning of Sacrifices, and a Summary Account of Sacrifices respectively. Dr. Westcott has expressed the opinion that in no ethnic religion does the truth of communion with the object of worship by means of sacrifice find fuller expression than in these ancient records of China.¹ And other truths lie just below the surface as we peruse them. But the impression left on the mind of the sympathetic reader is, I think, that of groping after something which at the time was fast slipping from human consciousness. We feel that those who compiled these records had no longer any affinity with the spiritual meaning of the ancient rites. Their whole attention is riveted on their utilitarian aspect. Any deeper meaning that may have been attached to the sacrifices to Heaven and Shangti in the past had already been overclouded by the extension of this worship to ancestors, to hills and streams, to individual spirits; yes, even to every power, seen or unseen, which could be conceived of as conferring benefits. Heaven is there still—the origin and root of all—but already so subdivided as to be practically lost.² The highest Power of all does not appear as if it were gradually coming into recognition—which, as a matter of fact, it has not done since—but as receding into oblivion, and as if the aspiration after It or Him had already departed, or was "nigh unto vanishing away". Yet these very books, amongst others, have preserved the names of that which they obscured, the august titles of Heaven and of Tî (the Ruler), by which, as I believe, to this day we may best express the notion of the Supreme. "Neither Taoism," says Dr. Legge ("Lî Ki," Vol. I, p. 388 note), "nor any other form of materialistic philosophizing has succeeded in eradicating the precious inheritance of these two terms from the mind of peasant or scholar." It is not of course asserted that the ideas connoted by these terms even 2000 years ago were not degenerate, Heaven already tending to denote the material heavens, and Tî tending to multiply into several Tî. Still less is it to be supposed that the use of these titles in the present day is not liable to misconception. But at the same time Dr. Legge's dictum on this subject will be supported by the experience of most missionaries in China; and the phenomenon referred to will find many parallels in the history of other nations.³

But I proceed at once to illustrate ancient Chinese belief and practice by quotations from these ancient records.

First of all as to the vexed question of the origin of sacrificial

¹ Commentary on Hebrews. Additional note on ix. 9.

² "Lî Ki," VII. § iv. 3, 4, quoted below.

³ Cf. Tisdall, "Comparative Religion," p. 87 f.

worship. Has Chinese tradition anything to say on this question? Does it decide between the conflicting views that sacrificial worship originated in a primitive Divine revelation, or that it is due to a universal instinct of mankind? These views are not so conflicting as to be mutually exclusive, because it is obvious that God would not institute a rite which did not find a response in natural instincts; nor does the fact that He in the first instance instituted a form of sacrificial worship exclude the possibility that man developed and extended the idea according to his own imperfect and rapidly degrading notions, as he wandered farther and farther away from the central truth. But the views are sometimes stated as opposed to one another, on the one side regarding an assumed Divine Command as the real origin of the universal practice, and on the other denying the existence of any such command, and tracing all to the primary instincts of mankind. Has Chinese tradition then anything to say on this subject? I shall quote three passages which seem to bear upon the question, but it will be seen that only the last is really in point, though each of the passages is possessed of considerable interest, and merits careful attention. In the Summary Account of Sacrifices¹ we meet with these words: "Of all the methods for the good ordering of men, there is none more urgent than the use of ceremonies. Ceremonies are of five kinds,"² and there is none of them more important than sacrifices. *Sacrifice is not a thing coming to man from without; it issues from within him, and has its birth in his heart.* When the heart is deeply moved, expression is given to it by ceremonies; and hence only men of ability and virtue can give complete exhibition to the idea of sacrifice." The words in italics at first sight seem to suggest that the origin of sacrificial worship is to be found in human instincts seeking to find expression. But the context shows that the speaker is concerned not with the origin, properly so called, of sacrificial rites, but rather with the oft-recurring burden of these books, that sincerity is of the very essence of ceremony. Sacrifice is only sacrifice so far as it is the expression of personal feelings, in no other way can a true sacrifice be produced. This quotation then sheds no light on Chinese belief as to the origin of sacrificial observance. In the Book of Ceremonial Usages, their Origin, etc.,³ we find the following passage: "At the first use of ceremonies they began with meat and drink. They roasted millet and pieces of pork; they excavated the ground in the form of a jar, and scooped the water from it with their two hands; they fashioned a handle of clay, and struck with it an earthen drum. (Simple as these arrangements were) they yet seemed to be able to express by them their reverence for spiritual beings." The context shows very

¹ "Lî Kî," xxii. 1.

² "The five kinds of ceremonies are the Auspicious (including all acts of religious worship), the Mourning, those of Hospitality, the Military, and the Festive." Legge, *in loc.*

³ "Lî Kî," vii. § i. 6.

plainly that the "spiritual beings" referred to are the spirits of the dead, so that the passage represents the current tradition as to the origin of ancestral worship. This is traced to the natural idea of preparing for the dead both meat and drink. But the words can scarcely be quoted as bearing upon the origin of sacrificial worship generally. There is, however, a striking passage in the Book of Rites in the Formation of Character¹ which has, I venture to think, very definite bearing upon this question. "A superior man will say, 'The usages of ceremony that come closest to our feelings are not those of the highest sacrifices; (as may be seen in) the blood of the border sacrifice;² the raw flesh in the great offering (to all the royal ancestors) of the ancestral temple; the sodden flesh where spirits are presented thrice; and the roast meat where they are presented once'. And so those usages were not devised by superior men to give expression to their feelings. There was a beginning of them from (the oldest times); as when (two princes) have an interview, there are seven attendants to wait on them and direct them, etc." The phrase "A superior man will say," at the commencement of this passage, is taken to denote that the sentiments are those of the speaker. In these words, then, we are listening to what a thoughtful man of the time gathered from his own observation of sacrificial observances, or shall we say to what such a man believed to be true according to the current tradition of his time, and he tells us three things. (1) Positively, there was a beginning of those usages from the oldest times. (2) Negatively, they were not devised by superior men in order to give expression to their feelings. (3) The striking fact had impressed him that with all the complication of sacrificial observances, one law, as we should say, seemed to govern the whole. The higher men mounted in the object of their worship, the farther its usages were removed from natural human feelings. He instances four kinds of sacrifice in a descending scale. In the highest form of sacrifice the offering of blood was the outstanding feature, a rite plainly remote from natural human feelings. In the lesser sacrifices men came ever nearer to their natural feelings, in offering first raw flesh, secondly sodden, and finally roast. This fact seemed to show to that "superior man" of old that far away there was some "beginning" of sacrifices remote from men, and that this worship—whatever it might be in its lower forms—was in its highest manifesta-

¹ "Li Ki," VIII. § ii. 6, 7.

² The "border sacrifices" are often mentioned. They denote the sacrifices to Heaven or God, the greatest of all sacrifices, celebrated in a suburb of the capital; though it is true that even 2000 years ago the idea of God had already been degraded into Heaven and Earth, and that famous kings had been correlated with Heaven and Earth at the border sacrifices, not, however, without distinctions being drawn between them and It. The four sacrifices here mentioned are (1) the sacrifice to Heaven, (2) the great sacrifice in the royal ancestral temple, (3) that at the altars of the land and grain and of hills and rivers, (4) sacrifices to individual spirits. Cf. "Doctrine of the Mean," XIX. 6: "By the ceremonies of the sacrifices to Heaven and Earth they served God (Shangti), and by the ceremonies of the ancestral temple they sacrificed to their ancestors".

tions at least not self-evolved. It is scarcely too much to say that we detect in this ancient writer a dim consciousness that the sacrificial worship of Heaven rested on some far-off revelation of the Will of Heaven. And if so, this passage is directly in point in our enquiry. We shall return to its consideration again. But meanwhile it is characteristic of this ancient literature to glide over these matters of spiritual import, and we are denied, what it would have been of such intense interest to obtain, any further insight into the deeper thoughts of these men of ancient days. The discussion passes at once into details of ritual in an interview between two rulers, and our interest is lost.

Notice, secondly, the profound sense which existed of the importance of sacrificial worship. In the Summary Account of Sacrifices¹ we read, "Ceremonies are of five kinds and there is none of them more important than sacrifices". "Sacrifice is the greatest of all things. Its apparatus of things employed in it is complete, but that completeness springs from all being in accordance with the requirements (of nature and reason)—is it not this which enables us to find in it the basis of all the lessons of the sages?" "The first and greatest teaching is to be found in sacrifice." It is quite true that in the mind of the compilers of this book the importance of the sacrifices resided mainly, if not entirely, in their illustration of mutual dependence and subordination; and as it is said "by the dealings with these was seen (the method of) government".² And where they are said to be in accordance with nature and reason the sole reference in the context is to the lesser forms of sacrifice, the great sacrifice to Heaven having for the time receded into the background. But if the lesser sacrifices were regarded as being of such great importance, a fortiori the sacrificial worship of Heaven must have been so; especially as there is reason to believe that they were derived from that worship. In support of this statement I would quote the following passage from the "Lî Kî"³: "By means of the ceremonies performed in the suburb (i.e. the Border Sacrifice to God), all the spirits (may we say 'all the manifold manifestations of Divine power'?) receive their offices. By means of those performed at the altar of the earth, all the things yielded (by the earth) receive their fullest development. By means of those in the ancestral temple, the services of filial duty and of kindly affection come to be discharged. By means of those at the five sacrifices, the laws and rules of life are correctly exhibited. Hence when the ideas in these sacrifices in the suburb, at the altar of the earth, in the ancestral temple, at the altars of the hills and streams, and of the five sacrifices of the house are fully apprehended, the ceremonies used are found to be lodged in them. From all this it follows that rules of ceremony must be traced to their origin in the Grand Unity. This separated and became heaven and earth. It revolved and became the dual force (in nature).

¹ "Lî Kî," XXII. I, 12.

² *Ib.* II.

³ VII. § iv. 3, 4.

It changed and became the four seasons. It was distributed and became the breathings (thrilling in the universal frame). Its lessons transmitted (to men) are called its orders; the law and authority of them is in Heaven." Whatever views may be held as to the meaning of certain expressions in this passage, a sort of half-consciousness that the sacrifice to God in the suburb of the capital is the type and exemplar for all other forms of sacrifice seems to linger about the words. And if so, then the earnest insistence elsewhere upon the due performance of the lesser sacrifices is an unconscious testimony to a primitive law of sacrifice, the authority of which is in Heaven.

We pass now to consider the intention with which sacrificial worship was rendered in ancient China. Dr. Westcott classifies ethnic sacrifices in the West as "eucharistic, deprecatory, and imprecatory".¹ It is interesting to find an identical classification in the "Lî Kî". "Sacrifices,"² we are told, "were for the purpose of prayer, or of thanksgiving, or of deprecation."

SACRIFICE AND PRAYER.

In the "Lî Kî" we find the statement, "A superior man will say, The object in sacrifices is not to pray".³ The context shows very clearly that the meaning of this remark is that sacrificing, whether to Heaven, or to ancestors, or to any other benefactors, was not with a view to the presentation of a petition, but with the purpose of *putting the worshipper into right relationship* with the Power approached. It was at once an acknowledgment of dependence, and a means of cultivating the sense of "submissive deference". "Whatever good was possessed by the Son of Heaven he humbly ascribed the merit of it to Heaven."⁴ When he divined it was to "show that he did not dare to take his own way, and giving honour to Heaven".⁵ Here we come upon the expression of a great truth. Both in pre-Mosaic days, and very notably by the Mosaic Law, sacrifice put the worshipper into right relationship with the Object of worship. It was not necessarily connected with the offering of any special petition, or the hope of obtaining any definite favour. That this true conception has been preserved in Chinese tradition the following quotation will show very plainly. "When the heart is deeply moved, expression is given to it by ceremonies, and hence only men of ability and virtue can give complete exhibition to the idea of sacrifice. The sacrifices of such men have their own blessing; not indeed what the world calls blessing (i.e. 'success, longevity, the protection of Spiritual Beings'—Legge, note). Blessing here means perfection; it is the name given to the complete and natural discharge of all duties. . . . It is only the able and virtuous man who can attain to this perfection, and can sacrifice when he has attained to it. Hence in the sacrifices of such

¹ Comm. on Hebrews. Additional note on ix. 9. "Theophrastus (quoted and adopted by Porphyry de abst. II. 24) classes sacrifices as *ἢ διὰ τιμὴν ἢ διὰ χάριν ἢ διὰ χρεῖαν τῶν ἀγαθῶν*."

² ix. § iii. 28.

⁴ "Lî Kî," xxi. § ii. 24.

³ viii. § i. 22.

⁵ Ib. § ii. 25.

a man he brings into exercise all sincerity and good faith, with all right-heartedness and reverence; he offers the (proper) things; accompanies them with the (proper) rites; employs the soothing of music; does everything suitable to the season. Thus intelligently does he offer his sacrifices; *without seeking for anything to be gained by them*; such is the heart and mind of a filial son."¹ Such, no doubt, was the meaning of Confucius when he said, "When I sacrifice, I receive blessing."² He said so," explains the annalist, "because he had the right way (of doing everything)." The object in sacrifices is not to pray; the blessing comes from the act of putting oneself into right relationship with the Power. But while we acknowledge the presence of a truth in this conception of sacrifice, we cannot but contrast it with the fulness of truth enshrined in that law of sacrifice which was developed under the Divine guidance. In the Divine Law sacrifice was invested with an objective power to put a man into relations of acceptance with God, while in Chinese tradition the whole effect is exhausted in stimulating and conserving the subjective sense of dependence. But even in the Mosaic Law the subjective side was prominent. Intelligent and sincere use of the Mosaic Law must have brought a man into a right spiritual attitude towards God, and this was indeed part of its purpose. Outside the chosen race the promise that accompanied the institution was early forgotten, and the evolution of religious ideas, apart from Divine guidance, soon brought men into many wrong relationships, as the sacrificial odes to ancient kings will show. There is no wonder then that the truth of the objective power of sacrifice was totally obscured. But the Chinese have preserved their hold of the partial truth that sacrificial worship helped to maintain right relations with the unseen.

Though, as we have seen, the offering of sacrifice was not ordinarily connected with the presentation of a definite petition, it was regarded as an act of prayer in the wider sense of approach to the Being invoked. "Sacrificing means directing one's self to."³ There is a striking passage on this subject in Mencius.⁴ "Though a man be wicked, yet if he adjust his thoughts, fast, and bathe, he may sacrifice to God." So that not only the Son of Heaven, as in actual fact through centuries of Chinese history, or the naturally Holy Man, if such could be found, but even the wicked man, if he inwardly repent and direct himself to the approach, may draw near to God through sacrifice. Man is in the deepest sense *naturally* for God. Sacrifice was then a means of approach to the Power invoked, and was always accompanied with words of invocation. "On occasions of prayer," we read, "a sacrifice was offered; but if there were no prayer, there was no sacrifice."⁵

What has been written above appears to be the Chinese conception of the connection between sacrifice and prayer. But the phrase which has just been quoted, "on occasions of prayer a sacrifice was

¹ "Lî Kî," xxii, 1, 2.

² *Ib.* viii, § i. 21.

³ *Ib.* xxi. 6.

⁴ Bk. IV, pt. 2, ch. xxv. 2.

⁵ "Lî Kî," xx. 5.

offered," suggests that when a definite petition was to be presented before any altar it would be accompanied with a sacrifice. And it is quite clear from many of the Odes that sacrifices were offered when praying for good seasons, for a prosperous journey or campaign, by a woman in praying for a child, etc. This may at first sight seem inconsistent with the dictum that "the object in sacrifice is not to pray". But the inconsistency may be only apparent. Prayer is a universal instinct, however acquired. And it is natural, in offering a petition, to endeavour to put oneself into correct relationship with the power involved. Hence it may be said that "the object of sacrifices is not to pray," while at the same time sacrifices ordinarily accompanied the prayers. There seems to be no trace in ancient Chinese tradition of any gross idea of bribery of the powers invoked by sacrifice.

SACRIFICE AND THANKSGIVING.

The conception of sacrifice as an act of thanksgiving occurs continually. The following passages may be taken in illustration: "All things originate from Heaven; man originates from his (great) ancestor. This is the reason why Kî was associated with God (at this sacrifice).¹ In the sacrifices at the border there was an expression of gratitude to the source (of their prosperity), and a going back in their thoughts to the beginning of (all being)."² Or again, "They brought together (some of) all the productions (of the harvest), and sought out (the authors of them) to present them to them as offerings. . . . They also presented offerings to (ancient) superintendents of husbandry, and to the (discoverers of the) various grains, to express thanks for the crops which had been reaped. . . . The ancient wise men had appointed all these agencies (of husbandry), and it was felt necessary to make this return to them." Nay, even "the (representatives of the) cats, because they devoured the rats and mice (which injured the fruits) of the fields, and (those of) the tigers, because they devoured the (wild) boars (which destroyed them)" were honoured with offerings.³ Of the Border Sacrifice it is expressly said, "It was a great act of thanksgiving to Heaven".⁴ Once more we read, "According to the institutes of the sage kings about sacrifices, sacrifice should be offered to him who had given (good) laws to the people; to him who had laboured to the death in the discharge of his duties; to him who had strengthened the state by his laborious toil; to him who had boldly and successfully met great calamities; and to him who had warded off great evils." Then follows a list of such worthies closing with the words: "All these rendered distinguished services to the people. As to the sun and moon, the stars and constellations, the people look up to them, while forests, streams, valleys, hills, and mountains supply them with the materials for use which they require. Only men and things of

¹ *Sc.* the sacrifice by the Kings of Kâu who traced their lineage to Kî.

² "Li Kî," IX. § II. 8.

³ *Ib.* § II. 9, 10.

⁴ *Ib.* IX. § II. 2.

this character were admitted into the sacrificial canon." As we read these words we admit that the presentation of offerings is a natural way of expressing gratitude for benefits received, and it is expressly stated that this practice was due to the institutes of the sage kings. But the type and pattern on which all these institutes are founded seems to be the act of thanksgiving to God. There is indeed no clear statement to this effect. But there is in the near context an apology for the association of a human benefactor with God, which suggests that the act was regarded as an innovation. "If there appeared anything infelicitous about the victim intended for God," we are told, "it was used for that intended for Kî. That intended for God required to be kept in its clean stall for three months. That intended for Kî simply required to be perfect in its parts. This was the way in which they made a distinction between the spirits of Heaven and the manes of a man. All things originate from Heaven; man originates from his (great) ancestor. This is the reason why Kî was associated with God (at this sacrifice). In the sacrifices at the border there was an expression of gratitude to the source (of their prosperity), and a going back in their thoughts to the beginning of (all being)."¹ As we contemplate this picture of ancient China, we seem to see first the association of nearer origins with the ultimate Origin of all, though not without a marked distinction being preserved between them. Next we see the diversion of the human mind to the manifold channels through which the blessings of Heaven are received, leading to practical oblivion of the Source and Fount of every good. This is one example, and only one, of what (outside the chosen race) has been the universal experience of mankind. It shows the necessity of an intervention by God to regulate His own original institution of sacrifice, and to limit it rigidly to an act of thanksgiving to Himself. So adapted was the institution to the natural instincts of mankind, that in their departure from God they would carry it with them, first associating other benefactors with Him, and then substituting them for Him. The limitation of sacrificial worship to God alone teaches men that everything in nature is merely his instrument.

SACRIFICE AND DEPRECATION.

It is not easy to find a clear instance of deprecatory sacrifice in the Chinese classics, though a wider acquaintance with the ancient literature would no doubt furnish instances.

In one of the Odes a hunting expedition by King Seuen (876 B.C.) is celebrated. It is there said, "A lucky day was *now*, and we sacrificed on it to the Ruler (of horses) and prayed". Dr. Legge quotes in his note on this passage from a Chinese work detailing the duties of the officer who had the care of the royal studs. "In the spring he sacrificed to the Father of horses (the spirit presiding in certain stars in the constellation Scorpio), in summer to the first breeder of horses, in autumn to him who first subjected horses to the chariot,

¹ "Lî Kî," IX. § II. 7, 8.

and in winter *to the spirit evil-affected to horses.*" This last is an undoubted instance of deprecatory sacrifice. The thought is also present in an Ode in which this same King Seuen "on the occasion of a great drought expostulates with God and all the spirits":—

The King said, Oh!
What crime is chargeable on us now
That Heaven thus sends down death and disorder?
Famine comes again and again.
There is no victim I have grudged;
Our maces and other tokens are exhausted:—
How is it that I am not heard?

The drought is excessive,
Its fervours become more and more tormenting.
I have not ceased offering pure sacrifices;
From the border altars I have gone to the ancestral temple.
To the (Powers) above and below I have presented my offerings, and then
buried them:—
There is no spirit whom I have not honoured.
How-tseih is not equal to the occasion;
God does not come to us.¹

This, however, does not so much suggest the deprecation of calamity by fresh sacrifices, as express astonishment that having in due course honoured all the unseen powers he should still suffer calamity. But it is clear that to the writer's mind the neglect of sacrifices invited calamity, and this thought was probably always present to the Chinese. In Mencius we read: "When the sacrificial victims have been perfect, the millet in its vessels pure, and the sacrifices offered at their proper seasons, if yet there ensue drought, or the waters overflow, the spirits of the land and grain are changed, and others appointed in their place".²

But this conception of placation by sacrifice is far removed from the Biblical doctrine of atonement. I have noticed indeed only one instance of atonement by substitution of life. It does not occur in the classics, but is related by Dr. Legge in his concluding note upon "The Announcement of T'ang" in the Book of History.³

This ancient prince of China died in 1753 B.C., and of him it has been said that "From his frequent invocations of Shangti we might be led to believe that he was a pious prince, who knew something of the true God" (Gutzlaff, "China Opened," Vol. I, p. 306). Dr. Legge speaks of him as "the one, perhaps, of all the ancient princes of China who gets the strongest hold of our sympathies and esteem;" and he then proceeds to relate the following incident which is recorded of him. He ruled over the empire for thirteen years, the first seven of which were marked by severe drought. The sufferings of the people were intense, and when the resources of the empire were exhausted, it was suggested at last that some human being should be offered in sacrifice to Heaven, and prayer for rain presented at the same time.

¹ "Odes," Pt. III, Bk. III, Ode IV, 1, 2.

² Bk. VII, Pt. II, ch. XIV, 4.

³ Shoo King, Pt. IV, Bk. III,

"It is for the people," said T'ang, "that rain needs to be sought. If a man must be the victim for such an object, I will be he." He then fasted, cut off his hair and his nails, and in a plain carriage drawn by white horses, clad in white rushes, *in the guise of a sacrificial victim*, he proceeded to a grove of mulberry trees, and there prayed, asking whether the calamity was due to any fault of his own. He had not done speaking when a copious rain fell. This story certainly seems to imply that sacrifices were sometimes offered with the intention of atoning for guilt. But the total absence of definite instances in the classical books may be compared with the infrequent mention of the sin-offering in Hebrew history. The same causes of natural antipathy to the teaching may have operated in both cases, but in the case of the Israelites it was modified by the tradition of the Levitical ritual, and the possession of the Levitical law. When, however, these were in abeyance, or became unknown to the people, we can understand how the other aspects of sacrificial worship, which were more naturalistic, superseded that which was most Divine. Exactly the same tendency may be noticed in the evolution of religious beliefs since Christ appeared. Where the Divine revelation is forgotten or ignored, the doctrines of sin and guilt are obscured; but where they are cherished, the conscience is tender, and the sense of sinfulness is profound.

But to return to Chinese tradition. I asked a Chinese friend whether he could give me any instance in the history of China when sacrifice was offered to atone for guilt. He replied that he believed that there was no such instance. On the contrary he quoted the classical instance of the young nephew of the Duke of Chow, who incurred guilt by suspecting his uncle of conspiring against his throne, whereas, as a matter of fact, the duke had offered his own life in place of his brother, the young king's father, when he was struck down by illness. Heaven sent grievous calamities upon the domain of the ungrateful nephew, who divined to know the cause. In the metal-bound coffer which contained the archives of former enquiries by divination was found the record of Duke Chow's vow and prayer (hitherto kept secret at the duke's desire), and the young king exclaimed: "We need not go on reverently to divine. Formerly the duke was thus earnest for the royal House, but I, being a child, did not know it. Now Heaven has moved its terrors to display the virtue of the Duke of Chow." The Duke was received back, and Heaven showed its approbation by giving plentiful rain and fruitful seasons.¹ In this case mere restitution atoned for guilt without any sacrificial observance. Indeed, my friend remarks, according to the teaching of the ancient classics, only a good man can offer sacrifice, the sacrifice of the wicked is abomination, as it is said, "Heaven has no affections, only to those who are reverent does it show affection. The spirits do not always accept the sacrifices which are offered to them, they accept only the sacrifices of the sincere."²

But it may be objected that it is pure assumption to state that the Chinese three thousand years and more ago had lost a tradition of

¹ "Shoo King," Pt. V, Bk. VI.

² *Ib.*, Pt. IV, Bk. V, Pt. III. 1.

atonement by bloodshedding, for the evidence can only show that they did not then possess it. Is there anything to suggest that they had ever possessed it? To the believer in the record of Scripture indeed there can be no doubt that a knowledge of this truth was a part of the original inheritance of the whole of mankind. The statement that "Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah, and took of every clean beast and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar," and that "Jehovah smelled the sweet savour, and He said in His heart, I will not curse the ground any more for man's sake," is itself sufficient to show that the forbearance of God towards sinful men was due to an acceptable offering, and that this was known to the second father of the human race. But it may be asked whether there is not some lingering recollection of this primitive knowledge to be found in the Chinese records, which can so far corroborate the testimony of Holy Writ? In answer to this question I would refer to a passage already quoted,¹ where it is said that "the usages of ceremony that come closest to our human feelings are not those of the highest sacrifices; (as may be seen in) the blood of the Border Sacrifice; the raw flesh in the great offering (to all the royal ancestors) of the ancestral temple; the sodden flesh where spirits are presented thrice; and the roast meat where they are presented once". A Chinese commentary on this says: "The Border Sacrifice, the sacrifice in the ancestral temple, and the sacrifice with threefold presentation of spirits, all have blood, and flesh, both raw and sodden and roast. The separate mention of them here is on account of the prominence given to each in the different sacrifices. In the Border Sacrifice² the Blood takes the first place, and afterwards come the raw, sodden, and roast flesh." No explanation is given of this strange fact. The annalist only draws the inference that there is here no institute of sage kings, or device of superior men. The origin of the rite goes back into ancient times of which he had no knowledge. But what, it may be asked, was the significance of blood to the ancient Chinese? "The offering of the blood," we are told, "was because of the breath which is contained in it."³ Combining these notices then we find a tradition that in approach to Heaven the offering of life was of first importance. Approach to God takes place, first and foremost, by shed blood. If this was not learned from ancient sage or king, and was in some real sense opposed to natural feelings, where did it originate? To this question Scripture gives us an answer. We have here, then, as I believe, the remnant of a primeval tradition. Approach to God by the blood-

¹ "Li Ki," VIII. 6, cf. *supra*, p. 384.

² Another characteristic of the Border Sacrifice was that it consisted of a single victim, always a calf ("Li Ki," IX. § i. 1). For sacrifices in the ancestral temple several animals and birds were used, both wild and domestic; e.g. sheep, hares, swine, dogs, fowls, pheasants, and even fish, dried and fresh ("Li Ki," I. § ii. Pt. III, 4). A further distinction was that the Border Sacrifice was consumed by fire (cf. "Shoo King," Pt. II, Bk. I, ch. III. 8), while other sacrifices were either buried (note in Chinese commentary on "Shoo King," ch. III, 6, as above) or formed the basis of a common meal.

³ "Li Ki," IX, § iii. 20.

shedding of animal sacrifice was part of the primeval Gospel, and here we find the truth embedded in Chinese tradition, even as it may be found, though often in terribly distorted forms, throughout the world.¹ The fact may remind us that the Chinese have not totally mislaid their title-deeds to an inheritance in the atoning Blood of Christ. But in the extension of the rite of animal sacrifice not only to human ancestors but even to hills and streams, to cats and tigers, how could the pure conception of atonement survive?² We see, both from the history of China and of the world generally, that there was absolute need for Divine intervention and for a Divinely ordered sacrificial law, if the witness of the original institution was to be preserved until the coming of the Christ.

We will next enquire whether Chinese tradition has any trace of a representative priesthood in approach to God by sacrifice. The Biblical record indicates that according to primitive custom the head of the tribe or clan acted as sacrificing priest. It was not until the time of Moses that a single family was chosen to bear this office, and the choice of Aaron was in direct connection with the development of a divinely ordered ritual Law of Sacrifice. But long before this took place the ancestors of the Chinese nation had separated from the common stock. Accordingly we find in their ancient traditions no trace of a priestly class, but the survival of the primitive tribal priesthood. And we find a lingering consciousness that there is some deep reason for this limitation in the power of approach to God. "It is only the sage," we read, "who can sacrifice to God."³ And if it be asked what is meant by a sage, we may reply in words from the "Doctrine of the Mean," describing the qualities of the sage. "All-embracing and vast, he is like heaven. Deep and active as a fountain he is like the abyss. He is seen and the people all reverence him; he speaks and the people all believe him; he acts and the people are all pleased with him. Therefore his fame overspreads the Middle Kingdom, and extends to all barbarous tribes. Wherever ships and carriages reach; wherever the strength of man penetrates; wherever the heavens overshadow and the earth sustains; wherever the sun and moon shine; wherever frosts and dews fall—all who have blood and breath unfeignedly honour and love him. Hence it is said, he is the equal of Heaven."⁴ These words in their context form part of, or at least follow, an eulogium of Confucius. But it is certain that Confucius himself would not have acknowledged the tribute, or have laid claims to the qualities of a sage. Nor has any instance been known of a man asserting his right as a sage to approach God by sacrifice. In China, as a fact, until quite recent years, only the sovereign sacri-

¹ Cf. Tisdall, "Comparative Religion," pp. 71, 72.

² The consecration of ancestral temples by blood-shedding ("Lî Kî," xviii. § ii. Pt. II. 33, quoted below) is hard to account for on naturalistic principles alone. More probably it is a transference to the worship of ancestors of customs anciently observed in the worship of Heaven, but apparently without any recollection of the significance of the rite.

"Lî Kî," xxi. 1. 6.

⁴ "Doctrine of the Mean," ch. xxxi. 3.

ficed to God ;¹ and he did so not in virtue of sage-like qualities, but in virtue of his office. He is "the Son of Heaven". "As ruling over all under the sky (the king) is called The Son of Heaven,"² a phrase which would be more literally rendered "Heaven-sonned," constituted, that is, a son by Heaven. It is in this capacity that the sovereign offered sacrifice to God ; not so much, I apprehend, as the representative of the people, but rather as one raised up from among the people by Heaven and thus placed in a special relationship with Heaven. He does not take this office to himself, but is appointed to it by the will of Heaven.

In the immediate context of the statement already quoted that "it is only the sage who can sacrifice to God," we read that "it is only the filial son who can sacrifice to his parents. Sacrificing means directing one's self to. The son directs his thoughts (to his parents), and then he can offer his sacrifice. Hence the filial son approaches the personator of the departed *without having occasion to blush*". Does there not lie beneath these words a consciousness that there is no one but the ideal man who can approach God without having occasion to blush ? A remarkable admission indeed, and a profound truth, the reflection of a deep instinct, however implanted or acquired. The Scriptural account of the matter is that Man was made for intercourse with the Creator, an intercourse which was interrupted by the Fall. It was renewed on terms of sacrificial worship, accompanied with the promise of a Deliverer, Himself Man, Who would undertake the cause of Man, and through suffering restore the broken fellowship between God and Man. Of this primitive revelation Chinese tradition has, I believe, preserved the following broken fragments : (1) approach to God by animal sacrifice, distinguished from other sacrificial rites by several marked features, (2) the special importance attached in this sacrifice to the shed blood of the victim, (3) the need of an ideal character in approach to God, (4) the actual exclusion of the whole race from such access, (5) the action of Heaven in appointing one who, in virtue of his office, maintained communion with God.

The remark of Dr. Westcott has been quoted that the thought of communion with the object of worship by means of sacrifice is more prominent in Chinese tradition than in any other ethnic religion. But it is easier to illustrate this conception from what is said of ancestral worship than from what is told us of the Border Sacrifice. I cannot discover that anything further was realized in the sacrifice to Heaven than the following passages will indicate. We are told that "The Border Sacrifice is the illustration of the Way of Heaven". It was apparently intended to bring Heaven and Its ways before the minds of the people. Accordingly³ "on that day the King assumed the robe with the ascending dragons on it as an emblem of the heavens. He wore the cap with the pendants of jade-pearls, to the number of twelve, which is the number of heaven. He rode in the plain car-

¹ Yet see the passage from Mencius quoted above Bk. IV, Pt. II, ch. xxv. 2.

² "Li Ki," Bk. I, § ii. Pt. I, 16.

³ *Ib.* Bk. IX, § ii. 6.

riage, because of its simplicity.¹ From the flag hung twelve pendants, and on it was the emblazonry of dragons, and the figures of the sun and moon, in imitation of the heavens. Heaven hangs out its brilliant figures, and the sages imitated them." This on the one hand, while on the other the people responded to the invitation by refraining from all mourning rites on the day of sacrifice; by watering and sweeping the road leading to the altar and turning it up fresh with the spade, and also by burning torches at the top of the fields in the neighbourhood; all this, we are told, without special orders from the king.² The sacrifice in this way became to the people "a going back in their thoughts to the beginning of (all being)".³ But this is, I imagine, the utmost extent to which an approach to God was realized in the Border Sacrifice. The general principle that "sacrificing means directing one's self towards the object of worship" is recognized, but in this sacrifice to Heaven the people stand "afar off".

Far different is the case when we come to the usages of ancestral worship, which are treated of at great length, and in which the idea of communion with the departed is distinctly emphasized. For example when describing a sacrifice in the ancestral temple we read that "the object of all the ceremonies is to bring down the spirits from above, even their ancestors; serving (also) to rectify the relations between rulers and ministers; to maintain the generous feeling between father and son, and the harmony between elder and younger brother; to adjust the relations between high and low; and to give their proper places to husband and wife. The whole may be said to secure the blessing of Heaven."⁴ Here, it is true, the thought of rectification of human relations obtrudes itself, but the bringing down of the spirits from above is put in the forefront, and in the next paragraph it is distinctly stated that "all is done to please the souls of the departed, and constitutes a union (of the living) with the disembodied and unseen".

But this union is not, I think, conceived of as realized otherwise than by the invited presence of the disembodied spirits and the reverent attention of the living. There is no idea of its taking place through partaking of the same viands.⁵ The common feast is a mere accessory, if I am not mistaken, in the Chinese idea of ancestral worship. Days of concentrated thought upon the departed must precede the sacrifice, after which one may "see those for whom it is employed".⁶ "The filial son in his lost abstraction of mind seeks to have communion with the dead in their spiritual state, if peradventure

¹ Cf. Bk. IX. § ii. 2: "The sacrifice was offered on the ground which had been swept for the purpose, to mark the simplicity (of the ceremony)"; or as again in paragraph 18, "from a regard to the simplicity of such an artificial altar". The victim was a single calf "to show the estimation of simple sincerity".

² *Ib.* par. 5.

³ *Ib.* par. 8.

⁴ "Lî Kî," VII. § i. 10.

⁵ Cf. *Ib.* IX. § iii. 11. "Husband and wife ate together of the same victim, thus declaring that they were of the same rank."

⁶ *Ib.* XXI. § i. 2.

they will enjoy his offerings, if peradventure they will do so.”¹ The spiritual beings are spoken of as partaking of the smell of the viands presented. “After the liquor was poured, they met (and brought in) the victim, having first diffused the smell into the unseen realm.”² In the context of this passage various methods are described for increasing the odour, which is intended to reach the body and animal soul of the deceased which have returned to the earth, and the intelligent spirit which resides “in the bright region above”. Certain fragrances accordingly are supposed to penetrate to the deep springs below, and others are diffused through all the building, where the spirit may be supposed to have been “brought down from above” by the preliminary ceremonies. In this way the departed enjoys the offerings. In another passage we read that the fat of the inwards is “burned so as to bring out its fragrance, and this was mixed with the blaze of dried southernwood. This served as a tribute to the intelligent spirit.”³ This was no doubt the most important part of the service in the Chinese mind, first the invitation to the departed spirits to be present, and then the recollected attitude of mind, and presentation of appropriate offerings by the living. At these sacrifices it was usual to have a personator of the dead, perhaps to assist the mind in realizing their (supposed) presence. The conclusion of the ceremonies is thus described.⁴ “At sacrifices there are the provisions that are left. The dealing with these is the least important thing in sacrifices, but it is necessary to take knowledge of it.” The custom at the sacrifices in the royal ancestral temple is then described. The personator of the dead first partakes. He “eats what the spirits have left”. When he rises the ruler and his three ministers partake of what he has left. When the ruler has risen, the six great officers partake. When they rise the eight officers partake. When these rose, each partook of what was before him, and went out and placed it in the court below the hall, when all the inferior attendants entered and removed it: “the inferior class ate what the superior had left”. The significance of this is explained not in so many words as communion with the spirits enjoyed by all, but as an example of the principles of true government, in which inferior grades, each in their due order, share in the favours enjoyed by the ruler. The words are worth quoting in full: “When the superior possessed the greatest blessing, acts of favour were sure to descend from him to those below him, the only difference being that he enjoyed the blessing first, and those below him afterwards; there was no such thing as the superior’s accumulating a great amount for himself, while the people below him might be suffering from cold and want. Therefore when the superior enjoyed his great blessing, even private individuals waited till the stream should flow down, knowing that his favours would surely come to them. This was shown by what was done with the relics at sacrifices, and hence came the saying that ‘By the dealing with these was

¹ “Li Ki,” xxi. § i. 9.

³ *Ib.* xxi. § ii. 3.

² *Ib.* ix. § iii. 16.

⁴ *Ib.* xxii. 10.

seen the method of government'." A high ideal of government indeed, but a very low conception of the meaning of sacrifice. The distribution of viands is with our author merely an exhibition of principles of government. "What is done at sacrifices afforded the greatest example of the dispensation of favours." I cannot myself think that there is here any idea of communion with the departed royal ancestors being shared by all alike. But it is just possible that this meaning may after all be present; and that "the greatest blessing" of which this text speaks is the communion with his departed ancestors which the ruler enjoys, and that this blessing is, in figure, passed down through all ranks of society.

It is supremely significant, however, that this sharing in the sacrificial viands is totally absent from the rites of the Border Sacrifice. If there was any conception amongst the ancient Chinese of communion with the objects of worship by sharing with them in a common meal, it was confined to their worship of the spirits of deceased ancestors. For, as already noticed, the calf which was offered in sacrifice to God was wholly burnt, there was no feast upon this victim. And the sacrifices to all other spiritual powers other than deceased ancestors were normally buried. A Chinese word denoting literally "firewood" is used distinctively of the sacrifice to Heaven, as may be seen in the "Shoo King,"¹ where Dr. Legge's translation "presented a burnt-offering to Heaven" represents this word, a single character in the Chinese. The Scriptural record leads us to think that the original form of animal sacrifice rendered to God was the burnt-offering. The sacrificial feast does not appear until the time of Jacob, and does not receive full Divine sanction and regulation until the time of Moses. It seems, then, that in this respect Chinese practice has adhered more closely to the primitive institution than has been the case in other nations.

We have now concluded our review of the Chinese tradition of sacrifice. What has been written is no doubt capable of considerable amplification, but it is hoped that materials for forming an independent judgment have been laid before the reader, as well as certain conclusions stated, and that sources of further information have been indicated. The writer confesses to a certain feeling of weariness, after traversing the too often barren wastes of this ancient Book of Rites: and the contrast is borne in upon him between the inconsequence, the inconsistency, the earthliness of this ritual book, and the symmetry and spirituality of that Divine Law of Sacrifice which is instinct with life, with Christ, with God. But at the same time he feels that enough has been said to substantiate the claim made at the outset, viz. that the Chinese nation in its most ancient records retains its title-deed (however defaced) to a share in the Great Salvation. The nation has indeed gone very far from God. It has admitted inferior powers to similar, if not equal honour with the Supreme, and as the inevitable result it has come to worship and

¹ Pt. II, Bk. I, ch. III, 8 and Pt. V, Bk. III, 3.

serve the creature instead of the Creator; for it is a question how much of the real Sacrifice to Heaven remains, if indeed it has any real distinctive existence at all at the present day. We are led by yet another path to a conviction of the necessity for a Divine intervention, if the primeval institution of approach to God by sacrifice was to be preserved in the world; and to a vindication of the Divine Wisdom, which selected a family and tribe, and entrusted to them the oracles of God for the ultimate blessing and salvation of all mankind.

NOTE ON THE CHINESE RITE OF BLOOD-CONSECRATION.

The passage from the "Lî Kî" referred to above is as follows:—

"When a temple was completed, they proceeded to consecrate it with the following ceremony: The officer of prayer, the cook, and the butcher, all wore the cap of leather of the colour of a sparrow's head, and the dark-coloured dress with the purple border. The butcher rubbed the sheep clean, the officer of prayer blessed it, and the cook with his face to the north took it to the pillar and placed it on the south-east of it. Then the butcher took it in his arms, went up on the roof at the middle point between the east and the west, and with his face to the south stabbed it, so that the blood ran down in front; and then he descended. At the gate of the temple, and of each of the two side apartments, they used a fowl, one at the gate of each (going up as before and stabbing them). The hair and feathers about the ears were first pulled out under the roof (before the victims were killed). When the fowls were cut at the gates of the temple, and the apartments on each side of it, officers stood, opposite to each gate on the north. When the thing was over, the officer of prayer announced that it was so, and they all retired, after which he announced it to the ruler saying, 'The blood-consecration has been performed'. This announcement was made at the door of the back apartment of the temple, inside which the ruler stood in his court-robcs, looking towards the south. This concluded the ceremony and all withdrew.

"When the great apartment (of the palace) was completed, it was inaugurated (by a feast), but there was no shedding of blood. *The consecration by blood of the temple building was the method taken to show how intercourse with spirits was sought.* All the more distinguished vessels of the ancestral temple were consecrated, when completed, by the blood of a young boar."

The reader must feel that in most respects this ancient ritual presents a marked contrast with the ritual of the Mosaic Law, but the truly remarkable feature of it lies in the words which have been italicized. These words may be applied as they stand to the blood-consecration of the Tent of Meeting and of all its vessels. We may say with deepest truth that "The consecration by blood of the Tabernacle was the method taken to show how intercourse with Jehovah was sought". The Chinese annalist does not explain the meaning of his remark as regards the worship of ancestors, nor is it easy to imagine what thoughts were in his mind as he penned the words; perhaps they were indeed but a reminiscence of the more ancient Chinese worship of God, in which the presentation of shed blood formed the most prominent feature, as we have seen already. And perhaps the rite had been mechanically transferred to that which was rapidly taking the place of Divine worship, the worship of deceased ancestors, when all appreciation of its atoning significance

had long since faded away. Confucius and his disciples were much more interested in the petty formal details of ritual than in their spiritual significance, and the writer may well have been at a loss to explain his own words. He merely repeated the traditional formula. But if so, it was at least a true tradition of the worship of God, that intercourse with Him was to be sought through the shed blood of animals, and that this ritual was intended to be the sign of a spiritual fact.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

(The references are to pages of this book.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>ALTAR of burnt-offering, 74, 121.
 „ of incense, 92, 119.
 Appointed Seasons, 343.
 Ark, 94, 115.
 Atonement, 155, 241.
 „ , Day of, 116, 126, 139, 258,
 352.
 Azazel, 272.
 BAPTISM, Holy, 33, 317.
 Bear iniquity, to, 133.
 Blood and water, 317.
 „ , drinking, 225.
 „ in Chinese tradition, 392, 398.
 „ , significance of, 28, 53, 184.
 Blowing of trumpets, 351.
 Blue, 128.
 Bread of God, 207.
 Burnt-offering, 169.
 „ „ in Chinese tradition,
 397.
 CANDLESTICK, 91, 118.
 Cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop, 315,
 330.
 Cherubim, 95, 363.
 Chinese tradition of sacrifice, 381.
 Clean in sacrificial sense, 149.
 Colours, 127.
 Combination of symbols, 29, 39, 166,
 316.
 Communion, Holy, 30, 225.
 Consecration of priests, 107, 125.
 „ , ram of, 109, 136.
 Continual, 120.
 Court, 68.
 Covenant, 42.
 Cubits, 68.
 DEAD, defilement by the, 326.
 Death, spiritual, 311.
 „ of Christ, 180.
 Drink-offerings, 288.
 Dwellings, leprosy in, 323.
 EATING, ceremonial, 133, 249, 304.
 Ephod, 100.
 Eve, 3, 12.</p> | <p>FAITH, 4, 17, 29, 56, 158, 162, 188, 204.
 Fast, the, 260, 262.
 Fat, 205.
 Feasts, the three, 49, 343.
 Feeding, spiritual, 224.
 Festal occasions, 342.
 Fire-offering, 204.
 First-fruits, 217, 350.
 Forgiveness, 242.
 Frankincense, 299.
 Freewill-offering, 173.
 GARMENTS, leprosy in, 322.
 Glory of Jehovah, 368.
 Goat, 237.
 Guilt, 277.
 HEAVE-offering, 215.
 High places, 184.
 High priest, 106.
 Holy and Most Holy, 248.
 Holy Things, 283.
 Holy Water, 333.
 Honey, 305.
 Hyssop, 315, 331.
 IMPUTATION or reckoning, 176.
 Incense, 57, 92.
 JEHOVAH, 12, 22.
 Jewish views, 178, 272, 275, 377.
 Jubilee, 353.
 KILLING of victims, 154.
 LARGE offerings, 346.
 Laver, 56, 76, 142.
 Laying on of hands, 151.
 Leaven, 215, 305, 350.
 Leprosy, 310.
 Levites, 98.
 Life, sacrament of new, 314.
 Living water, 315, 325, 331.
 MANSLAYER and the High Priest, 106,
 126.
 Martyr-aspect of the Death of Christ,
 210.</p> |
|--|--|

- Meal-offering, 288.
 " " of jealousy, 33.
 " " of the priests, perpetual,
 294, 298.
 Memorial, 301.
 Mercy-seat, 95, 115.
 NATURES, union of two, 36, 38, 116,
 122, 128.
 Nazirite, 335.
 Nazirites and priests, 337.
 " " prophets, 341, 357.
 New Meal-offering, 294.
Nezer, 339.
 OBLATION, 172.
 Omissions, significance of, 13, 17, 40.
 Oil for anointing, 57, 120.
 " " lamps, 92, 118.
 " " meal-offering, 295.
 " " peace-offerings, 214.
 " " in cleansing of a leper, 320.
 Original or birth sin, 325.
 PRAYER and offering, 162.
 Priesthood of Aaron, 97, 124.
 " of Aaron's sons, 138.
 Priests, pre-Mosaic, 181.
 Prophets and kings, 358.
 " " the Law of Offerings, 380.
 " " Nazirites, 341, 357.
 " " priests, 357.
 " " order of, 356.
 Pure, 120.
 RED, 328.
 Red Heifer, 327.
 Repentance, 29, 159, 318.
 Representation, 153.
 Resurrection from the dead, 18, 50, 316,
 332, 350.
 SABBATH, 345.
 Sacrifice of Peace-offerings, 196.
 Salt, 92, 306.
 Scapegoat, 271.
 Scarlet, 315.
 Service, sacrament of new, 318.
 Set-feasts, 343.
 Shew-bread, 88, 118.
 Shiloh, 355, 356.
 Sin, nature of, 231, 253, 282.
 Sin-offering, 108, 228.
 Spirit, the Holy, 33, 52, 57, 118, 120,
 137, 316, 321.
 Spiritual Death, 311.
 Substitution, 153.
 Sweet savour, 193.
 TABERNACLE, 77, 113.
 " " curtains of, 83, 117.
 " " door of, 81.
 " " veil of, 80.
 Tent, 84.
 Tent of Meeting, 62, 114.
 " " " door of the, 71.
 Teraphim, 101.
 Thanksgiving, sacrifice of, 200.
 Third day, 16, 219, 331, 350.
 Trespass, 280.
 Trespass-offering, 277.
 UNCLEANNESS, ceremonial, 325.
 Unknown murderer, expiation for the
 sin of an, 334.
 Unwitting sin, 232.
 VEIL, the, 80, 116, 144.
 Vestments, priestly, 99, 128.
 Vows, 173, 335.
 WASHING, ceremonial, 127, 268, 330.
 Wave-offering, 218.
 Whole burnt-offering, 170.
 Will, 178.
 YOUNG bullock, 237.

265.323R
M861

AUTHOR

Moule, W.S.

TITLE

The Offerings Made Like Unto

265.323R

M861

D

